THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIII.—OCTOBER, 1898.—No. 92.

## LIVING NATURE.

IN a recent article in this REVIEW[1] we brought forward a number of biological facts sufficient, we think, to convince any unprejudiced reader that a mechanical conception of the universe is utterly insufficient and inadequate; that there is a guiding energy latent in nature; and that the different specific forms the living world offers to our curiosity and admiration, do not owe their origin to mere utility, but to some power external or internal, which we may at least distinguish as an X power.

These theses I took up, in 1869, and defended in my first book, "The Genesis of Species." My arguments have often been discounted by opponents who have falsely asserted, or supposed (with, of course, unintentional falsehood), that my efforts have been due, not to zeal for science, in the full sense of that sacred word, but to theological prejudice. I am, of course, proud to affirm that I have striven (I venture to hope not altogether without success) to defend churchmen from unjust aspersions, as I have not less defended men of science from unjust aspersions, but I have never taken up a position "on false pretenses." To my surprise and disgust, I have recently learned, through private conversation with my friend, that most eminent biologist, Prof. Ray Lankester, F.R.S., that my biological views and arguments have been attributed, by some prominent naturalists, to a desire on my part to champion views with which biology has no connection. I therefore desire permission here distinctly to deny such an imputation. I repudiate it with all the

[1] See vol. xxiii, No. 89, January, 1898, p. 28.

energy of which I am capable, and seize this opportunity to express my true meaning. When I urge, as I do now, and have so frequently urged before, that such facts as those advanced in my paper, before referred to, are fatal to a mechanical, utilitarian explanation of the origin of specific characters (because *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*) I also unhesitatingly and unequivocally affirm that they are none the less (as a matter of course) due to natural, biological causes. I know no causes *in nature* but natural causes; nevertheless not all natural causes are mechanical ones.

The objection to a mechanical, utilitarian (and therefore the Darwinian), philosophy of nature, is due to the intellectual limitations which, as it seems to me, must attend its acceptance. My rejection of it is, of course, largely due to my conviction of the inadequacy of the causes assigned and the existence of so many conspicuous facts for which it fails to account. But my objection is based even more on its inherent intellectual vulgarity than on its inadequacy. After nearly forty years' meditation and examination of the subject, I remain convinced that the cause of specific characters still remains an unsolved enigma. I am not without hope that its solution may one day be achieved, but I am profoundly convinced that it never will be achieved till the facts and laws of psychology, as they exist in man and lower organisms, have become much more widely understood, and till the light thus gained has been reflected on questions of ordinary physiology. My hope and aim in the present paper is to contribute one mite towards so desirable a consummation. I would also wish to insert a corollary drawn from the contemplation of the living world of irrational creatures, which seems to me well calculated to afford comfort and consolation to human beings with respect to a matter which concerns the tenderest feelings of which mankind is capable and their more pathetic aspirations.

But before proceeding to consider any of the facts presented to our contemplation by animated nature, let us, as it were, lay a foundation for our work by means of some indisputable facts with respect to the world which is devoid of life. And in the first place let us consider the proportion borne by the latter to the former. Surely, if one department of nature is out of all proportion quantitatively in excess of others, the laws which we find inherent in the far larger part may *à priori* be expected to persist, however they may be supplemented, in the relatively fragmentary portion of the universe.

But what is the universe? Of what does it consist so far as

we can know? Of course there may be many modes and kinds of existence and being which our faculties have no power to perceive. What our five senses and their various diverse combinations are able to give us cognizance of, may be the merest fragment of the entire physical cosmos. Nevertheless, since *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*, we may leave all these probabilities out of account and content ourselves with what our faculties are able to appreciate.

Have other worlds, as the earth has, living inhabitants? To this question we can give no positive answer, though analogy would surely suspect that some, if not many, of the heavenly bodies are inhabited. But whether they are so or not, the physical conditions of great spaces in the heavens would seem to indicate that the worlds destitute of life must be numerous, if they do not, as they probably do, greatly predominate in numbers. Even in our little corner of the universe, though Mars and Venus may be peopled with living creatures, it is very improbable that such is the case with Mercury, while those vast orbs, Jupiter and Saturn, seem most likely to be destitute of organic life.

And when from considerations of space we meditate on the abyss of past time, and think over the past physical history of our own globe, who can doubt that the time it has existed as a theatre of organic life is nothing compared with that vast period during which it revolved a mere mass of mineral matter, lifeless, however physically active. And even now inorganic matter forms so enormously preponderant a part of its total composition that if all the organisms which now live, both vegetable and animal, were evenly spread out over its surface it would thereby be invested with but a very thin film of organic matter.

In our consideration of the universe, therefore, and in our consideration likewise of the physical conditions and energies of our own globe as a whole, *inorganic* matter may well be taken as the type and form when we would study the laws which govern material existence considered as one whole.

We should do so the more certainly, and it is the more evidently our business so to proceed, when we reflect that it has now become a matter of certain knowledge that inorganic substances which exist in our own earth also exist and exist with the same properties and subject to the same laws in the remotest regions of the vast cosmos open to human ken, as also that they have there existed for long years, as is plain from the time required to enable the light of the remotest stellar bodies visible to reach the eyes of the keenest of our astronomers.

And what does the mineral and inorganic world declare to us as to the laws of its being and the reign of law?

Surely, as that eminent Professor of Crystallography, Professor H. A. Miers, has said:[1] "Nowhere is the evidence of the permanent order that prevails in Nature written in more lustrous and indelible characters than in the mineral kingdom." He spoke truly, indeed, since every crystalline species has its own absolute internal constitution and laws by which it continues, from age to age, what it is and no other—the visible expression of a definitely constituted nature, through which ceaseless order reigns.

It is from the mineral that a more important argument may be brought forward in support of our contention that the varied, often beautiful, often curious characters which serve to define any species of mineral or plant are not due to utility or any merely mechanical cause. For does not the whole inorganic world teem with wonders? What is more wonderful than the beauty of marble and serpentine, of malachite and lapis lazuli, of the sapphire, the emerald and the opal? Yet these wonderful spars and gems, with their endless varieties of form and color, their intricate groupings of silky fibres and pearly flakes, have been for ages hidden in the dark recesses of the earth in a long, uniform, unchanging existence. They have their minute laws of form and their various definite properties; they have their specific anatomy and most definite physiology, but these, most certainly are not due to any form of "selection" which has resulted in the triumph of utility. An, as yet unknown, energy, no physical force shows itself even here, as it does evidently and eminently in the domain of life.

And how does experience lead us to regard the energies which exist in living nature? Long ago, in our work "On Truth"[2] we have urged that one single dominant energy or "principle of individuation" is that which *par excellence* causes each individual animal and flint to be that which it is—determines its individual, specific and generic characters. The necessity of such a dominant individuating principle is especially manifest in the process of growth—especially that form of growth which constitutes reproduction. For the development of the ovum a fit environment is, of course, necessary; just as the existence of the requisite *external* physical agencies are required for the development of a grain of corn. Still it is the nature and *internal* condition of the living corn-grain which is, emphatically, the cause of its growth, and such is also the case as regards the living ovum.

---

[1] In his inaugural lecture as Waynflete Professor at Oxford.

[2] See pp. 420–440.

Many modern naturalists (such as Bourne, Whitman, Vägeli, Weismann and others) have attempted to explain the development of entire organisms and their germs by imagining the existence in each of a multitude of most minute particles, to which hypothetical bodies curious traces have been supplied,[1] and to which a variety of vital functions are attributed. But each and all of these imaginary particles, when carefully considered, will be found no less to need explanation than do the phenomena they are called on to explain. By making use of such conceptions the difficulty as regards vital phenomena is simply pushed a step backwards. Such efforts at explanation are all necessarily vain because they attempt what is simply improbable. However much we may minimise or subdivide such supposed material elements, the same difficulty will ever recur. In the same way as that in which, when we seek to explain the physiology of an organism by the functions of its cells, each cell, so considered, becomes but an organism itself, "but small." So each of the imagined particles above referred to may be said to be practically enlarged into a "cell," the functions of a cell being so largely attributed to it. This attribution is a necessary one on the hypothesis of the above-named writers, since the mere juxtaposition of particles devoid of vital properties could never, it is evident, account for vital phenomena, such as growth and reproduction, to say nothing of sensation and reflex-consciousness.

However we may play with such images by the aid of a subtle and fertile imagination, the same inevitable and insoluble difficulty will ever recur. Indeed the most fertile producer of imaginary biological hypotheses of our own day (Professor Weismann) has in effect distinctly admitted this in declaring that so long as we know practically nothing about *forces* which act among the particles he terms "biophors," they cannot afford us what he regards as an explanation of vital phenomena. If we choose we may, of course, decline to seek for such explanation of those phenomena; but, if we yield to that impulse of our nature which impels us in search of causes, then we shall be compelled to have recourse to some radically different conception, and a conception which many persons find it difficult to conceive of. In the various activities commonly called "vital," we can perceive various parts of an organism under successively different conditions. But the activities themselves, whatever may be their nature, are not also mate-

[1] Such, *e.g.*, as biophors, gemmules, plastriules, micelli, inotagmata, idiosoms, plasms, etc., etc.

rial substances, and are utterly and forever imperceptible to our senses. If they are not material substances then their nature must be "immaterial," and by that fact they are entities which are absolutely unimaginable. For we can never imagine anything save what as a whole, or in its constituent parts, has been for us an object of sensuous experience.

Weismann's "biophors," and the particles supposed to exist by other biologists, are terms for mental images of material particles which differ only from bodies perceptible to the senses, because they are supposed to be of such exceedingly minute size. They are, therefore, necessarily incapable of serving us as means to present any immaterial energy to us, and the use of them to explain any vital phenomena is equivalent to an attempt to make imaginary representations of things "perceptible to the senses" serve as representations of things "imperceptible to the senses," which is manifestly an absurd attempt.

But the essential irrationality of this process passes, often unnoticed, because reiterated attempts to imagine an immense multiplication and complication of minute parts and their motions tends so to fatigue the mind as to make some persons think that by having their imagination thus overruled by a complication of images they had really attained to a satisfactory explanation.

What then is this radically different conception which is for us the only satisfactory one?

Each living creature is a unity which is yet duplex—a unity of visible material and a unity of invisible energy. In one way it might be said to possess a *body* and a *psyche* or "soul," but that, so to speak, would seem to imperil its absolute living unity. But it is a unity which is composite in so far as it has arisen from two factors; just as water is a unity which has arisen by the *union* (not the addition) of two factors—oxygen and hydrogen. These factors no longer exist side by side within it. Neither exists the water alone—possessing however the potentiality of resolution (not division) into the two elements whence it arose. But as no two plant substances can be identical in nature and energy, and as elements with different natures and energies must act with different effects, so we must conclude that in their union to produce water each element must have had some different effect upon the result.

Also, since their energies must have been different in force and activity, one of the two must have been more vigorous and active than the other. It thus becomes conceivable (though not imaginable) how in the coming of a new creature into being, from the uni-

fication of a certain mass of matter into a certain definite kind of energy, there may be, in its complete subsequent unity, some characteristics resulting from one of its sources of unity, and the other from the other, and also it may well be that one of its sources of unity may be active, dominant and equalative, as to its effects, rather than the other relatively passive. According to the old comparison of Aristotle, a piece of wax stamped with a definite impress is an individual thing. Yet the figure it bears is ideally distinguishable from the material substance which bears that impress. Judging by observations of animals, and by analogy (as we shall see later) of these cases, it is the immaterial factor of the animal unity which is the immanent principle of individuation and the active agent in its development, nourishment, growth, reproduction and sensitivity. Thus understood, it is the soul which makes the living organism what it is, though it have no actual existence apart from the material body it conforms and vivifies. As the German philosopher Wundt has said: "The psychical life is not the product of the bodily organism, but the bodily organism is rather a psychical creation." We have no shadow of evidence to lead us to suppose that in any organism more than one immaterial principle of individuation has coexisted. Therefore to it has been due every vital action of an organism, even the lower organic processes which not only pass unnoticed but are quite incapable of being felt. Thus if when we contemplate any living animal—such as a dog—we regard its material organism as composing it exclusively, we fall into the greatest of mistakes. We cannot say that the dog's soulless body or its soul constitutes the dog; for, as long as it *lives*, not only is there no body absolutely, but no soul absolutely. Nevertheless, if we are forced to use an inadequate expression, it would be much less incorrect to say that the soul has made, maintains, and is the dog, rather than that its mere body has been and is thus influential. Of course, immediately after death there is a mere body and there is no soul. What has resulted—as regards the soul—when the bifold unity has come to an end, we have no evidence to show, nor any clear analogy to guide us. Although no certain reply can, so far as I know, be given to this question, help towards its solution would be obtained could we be certain as to the true objective relation in which the intelligence of the higher animals stands to that of humanity. That they have a ready apprehension of much of the world surrounding them is unquestionable, but "do these animals perceive relations?" This is, in my opinion, the crucial question of comparative psychology. I am profoundly convinced that all the or-

dinary activities of animals can be explained without attributing to them any such power, and Professor Lloyd Morgan, who has paid so much attention to this problem, has arrived at the same conclusion in his "Introduction to Comparative Psychology." He relates many interesting experiments which he performed in order to convince himself on this subject. For three days he tried to make a fox-terrier bring a stick through a railing wherein one rail was wanting, leaving an aperture of about a foot. At the end of his many trials on the first day, the dog only succeeded (after repeated trials and coaxings) in pushing his way through, after many abortive attempts, by holding his head on one side. The second day ended in complete failure. On the third day he had not in the least improved in bringing the stick through, but had learnt to shirk the difficulty by running around the railings. After some weeks the experiment was repeated with no better results. On a subsequent occasion his master prepared a short stick with a crook at one end. This caught in the rail, and, after many attempts, the dog dropped it. He was then induced to take it by one end and drag it after him, so that it might catch by the crook at the other end; he then tugged at it with energy as ridiculous as fruitless. The experimenter tried to show the dog how the difficulty could be overcome. But each time the crook caught he pulled it with all his strength. At length he seized the crook itself, and with a wrench broke it off. A chance passer-by thereupon made the sapient remark: "Clever dog that, Sir; he knows where the hitch do lie!"

The result of this and many similar experiments was to convince Mr. Lloyd Morgan that the dog's method consisted simply of sensuous experience, and not of any perception of relations.

As to the question, "Can animals reason?" the answer must depend upon what is meant by reason, and the difficulty in estimating the reasoning powers of animals, is in most cases due to the ignorance of observers with respect to their own. As the author referred to shrewdly remarks: "The psychologist is apt sometimes to smile when after the recital, probably in the correspondence columns of a newspaper, of some anecdote of animal intelligence, the writer exclaims, 'If this is not reason, I do not know what reason is.' As, however, in such cases the writer has himself suggested the alternative, there is, perhaps, no discourtesy on the part of the psychologist in accepting it."

I have so fully laid down in my work "On Truth," and also in the pages of this REVIEW, the distinction which exists between our higher and our lower faculties, that I need not take up space here by a description of the characteristics of the human rational faculty.

But does the absence in animals of reasoning properly so called, of a perception of relations as such, and of articulate, intelligent speech constitute a necessary and absolute breach of continuity in the process of evolution? And here we may usefully revert to a brief consideration of the inorganic world in words presented to us by Mr. L. Morgan:[1] "If," he says, "we make a heavily saturated solution of chloride of lead in hot water, and set the solution on one side to cool, we shall see, after a while, that myriads of minute acidular crystals of chloride of lead make their appearance and sink to the bottom of the vessel in which the solution is contained. Here is a simple case of development or evolution. Let us take note of some of the features it discloses. In the first place, the crystals have a definite geometrical form, exhibit differential expansion under the influence of heat, and possess peculiar optical and electrical properties. In a word, the crystals are the result of a selective synthesis, special in its nature and determinate in its products. Secondly, this selective synthesis can only manifest itself under appropriate environing conditions. . . . Thirdly, if we trace backward the evolution of one of these crystals, we reach a point—that at which the crystal began to form as such—where there is apparent break of continuity; by which I mean, not a gap or hiatus in the ascending line of development, but a point of new departure."

This brings us to the great point, which concerns us here, Are these true and absolute breaches of continuity in psychical evolution? As to this our author declares, "that the step from consentience,[2] or sense-experience, to reflection and thought, involves such a new departure. The curve of the development of sense-experience and intelligence pursues a smooth upward course, but when the perception of relations is introduced there is a new departure. The curve takes a wholly new direction and sweeps up to the highest products of rational thought."

He also gives in his paper a diagram representing the curve of sense-experience, from which another curve diverges, at a sharp angle and in an opposite direction, thus representing the first introduction of the process of reflection. He intends these diverging lines to denote graphically the difference between the lower animals and man, and plainly declares, "we may say that there is a breach of continuity of development at this stage of evolution analogous to the breach of continuity between the inorganic and organic phases of development. This is the view to which I myself incline.

---

[1] P. 234.

[2] As to this term, see my *On Truth*, pp. 189, 219 and 354.

It is, indeed, refreshing after the large amount of absurdity which has been published during the past generation on this subject, to meet with a competent naturalist so coinciding in judgment with the unprejudiced mind of Aristotle. According to this modern author man is the only animal capable of turning the mind back to examine its present experience, and its anterior experiences, of apprehending relations as relations, and gifted with self-consciousness and the power of ratiocination. Surely it is difficult to exaggerate the difference which must exist between a being capable of all this and one not so capable! Yet this difference is by no means all the difference between animals and man. Coinciding with this exceptional power of perceiving relations is that of appreciating "goodness" as such. Moreover, at the root of all these higher faculties lies the power of abstraction, through which the human intellect is able to apprehend absolute, necessary and universal truths, such as those expressed by the law of causation and those primary truths which constitute the foundation of all science and which need no proof, being clearly evident in and by themselves. A nature possessing such powers must surely be different *in kind* from one which does not possess them, and the former, as we have so often contended, could never have been evolved from the latter.

Nevertheless it is especially desirable that we should not be led into exaggeration, and declare that to be necessary and evident which is neither the one nor the other. Now it is certain that every man and woman, however high may be the intellectual eminence to which he or she may have attained, had at one time no perceptible intellect at all. Not only is such the case with every human embryo before birth, but for some time after birth it can hardly be said to have even distinct sense-perceptions, while it takes years for any real development of the intellect. Yet that intellect was latent from the first. The nature of the infant both before and after birth is such that normally it has become manifestly intellectual when all the suitable conditions of favoring environment have lasted long enough. It may therefore be asked, and it has been often asked: "If intellect though imperceptible is yet latent and apt for evolution in the human embryo and infant, why may it not also be latent and apt for evolution in the higher animals—the dog and the ape?" "May not the only reason why such animals do not manifest intellect be because their lives come to an end without their having attained the requisite internal and external conditions needful for its manifestation; as would be the case with every human infant that did not live for more than a year?"

Now, certainly, we cannot affirm it to be evident that the pres-

ence of such a latent intellectual nature in animals is impossible, and if it is not only possible but also actual, then there is no reason we can see why the human intellect should not, like the human body, have been evolved from the lower animals.

Certainly, the absence of latent, true intelligence in the nature of animals is not a necessary truth absolutely evident; but to us it appears in the highest degree improbable that a countless multitude of creatures should have come into being, all destined inevitably to perish without attaining to the exercise of the full powers of their nature, just as infants and idiots may, by exception, similarly perish. We cannot, then, affirm the universality of this difference of kind to be absolutely evident, though there is a mass of evidence which renders the latent and potential intellectuality of animals to be in the highest degree improbable.

But, however lofty and aloof from mere animal psychosis power of the human intellect may be, there is one point wherein men and animals are at one. They are at one in that each of them possesses but a single and individual immaterial energy operating in all their vital functions from mere nutrition to the sublimest speculation. There is no evidence whatever that a living man consists of "body and soul"—as Descartes taught. We have no experience of any "soul" possessed by us or any activity not that of the body, any more than we have any experience of any "body" possessed by us which is separate from the vital activity which animates it. Thus every man and woman, like every animal and plant, is a material unity with (so to speak) two agents formed of the absolute union of matter with an immaterial energy of a separate kind which gives to that individual mass of matter its generic, its specific and its individual characteristics and constitutes the most absolutely essential portion of its being. And as we have before urged, the immaterial energy is constitutive of even inorganic bodies.

By the admission that their active immaterial energies (the "forms" of Aristotle) of diverse ranks and orders, which, by absolute coalescence with different portions and qualities of matter, constitute all the substances known to us, from hydrogen or carbon to the philosopher who experiments with them, the phenomena of the universe may be, at least, intelligently apprehended. Thus the breaches of continuity which show themselves between the non-living and the living, between the merely living and the sentient, and between the merely sentient and the intellectual, can be, to a certain extent, understood. So also can the defects and limitations of our faculties, even the highest kinds of

which need for their efficient support and activity the merely animal powers of the lower part of our nature, such as sensation, imagination, sense-perception, and, together with those, sensuous reminiscence and inference. So also are the imperfections of the psychical powers of animals explicable as due to the want, in them, of that higher kind of principle, or "form," which enables us to look back and consciously recognize relations as relation, our own existence, and abstract truths, both necessary and universal, and to become possessed of ethical perceptions. No distinct object in the world, whether mineral, vegetable, animal or rational, is other than a unity in itself; yet no such object is material only, but owes its innate capacities, and its active powers, to the principle which forms and constitutes it what it is. This conception, though so long familiar to the most acute intellects this world has known, it is impossible adequately to express, because, speak as we may, our words will always suggest to the imagination that "matters" and "forms" are the separate, extended, entities existing side by side in each creature, instead of two unextended entities which together constitute that creature a unity in itself. The conception may be made easier, strange to say, by some fashionable "monistic" theories of the day. Thus, according to them, as well as according to the philosophy of Aristotle, every chemical transformation, every product of decay, death and dissolution, all the changes of embryonic developments, and all the various originations of new species, are one and all regarded as simultaneous changes in successively evolved unities, each with its aspects of "matter" and "form" respectively. Neither of these ever exists separately, according to either of these systems, the corruption of one substance and the formation of others being absolutely synchronous, though we are utterly unable to imagine such simultaneity.

As to the question of what becomes of animals when they have ceased to live, that must depend on the essential nature of that individuating and dominating energy which makes each creature that which in fact it is, whether it is essentially similar to that of man, though ever hindered by its environment from making its intellectuality manifest, or whether it is different in kind and of an altogether inferior nature.

Let us, then, briefly glance at the most remarkable characteristics of the highest energy which man possesses—the energy which enables him to attain to science. "Science" is the highest and most certain knowledge attainable, and that knowledge is divisible into three categories :

A. The most certain of all knowledge is that which is seen to be absolutely, universally, and necessarily true—as, *e.g.*, the "principle of contradiction," "nothing can come into being without a cause," etc.

B. Most certain also is that which is seen necessarily to follow as a consequence from premisses the truth of which is certain. If we cannot absolutely depend on such deductions, we can infer nothing, and so all reasoning, and therefore all science, is impossible.

C. The most certain fact perceived by us is the fact of our personal existence, the continuance of which is made known to us by consciousness aided by memory—the latter enabling us to be as certain with respect to certain events of our past as we are of our actual present experience.

And reflection furnishes us with a knowledge of many most important and significant truths as to the nature of the human soul, by pondering over its most remarkable activities.

The force energizing in a man's own consciousness he knows to be a continuously subsisting principle, conscious of successive objects and events, and capable of holding them before it in one conception as members of a series every part of which it transcends. Such a principle, aware of the trends and directions of its own intellectual activities, consciously present to them and capable of reviewing its own status and external objects and events in various orders, cannot itself be multitudinous, but must be as much a unity as possible—that is a simple unity. Moreover, this principle, as one which apprehends not only absolute, necessary and universal truth, but also hypothetical and possible truths, must be something altogether different from what we apprehend as matter and merely physical force. If, then, we know (as we certainly do know) material bodies and physical forces at all, it is *absolutely certain* that this intellectual persistent principle is neither one nor the other, but stands out in the strongest contrast with both. Therefore (to return once more to a matter already stated, but which can hardly be too much written on) if we know—as, of course, we do—that we have material bodies, we see for certain that our own being is a bifold unity.

It is a unity, for we perceive it is as much the "I" who feels, moves, grows or decays, as it is the "I" who thinks. We are certain, indeed, as to the existence of our body, but it is absolutely *impossible* for us to really doubt the existence of our self-conscious, thinking principle, or that we are one being—one body and one immaterial principle forming an absolute unity possessing two

sets of faculties. It is thus material and physical in one aspect, immaterial and intelligent in the other aspect. No certainty which we can attain to above any external object can be nearly so certain as this certainty we have concerning our own being—first, and above all, as to the immaterial, dynamic aspect of our being; and secondly, as to its material and physical aspect. This is the primary and highest truth of physical science.

What, then, when death reduces our active energizing being to a mere heap of relatively inert matter so far as our senses can perceive? Is there, apart from all we learn through revelation, any substantial energy surviving? Is there any still existing soul?

Surely, as we have before urged,[1] when once we are convinced of the truth of Theism, confidence in a future life naturally follows. Moreover, though we cannot affirm, apart from this, that our immortality is a belief which is plainly and evidently certain, it is none the less reasonable and congruous, and most assuredly there is no evident truth which contradicts it. It is remarkable and congruous when we remember what is the nature of that intellectual principle within us, the power and faculties of which we have just considered. That intellectual principle, if it survives dissolution, no longer possesses apart from the body any means (so far as we can tell) whereby it can make its continued existence known to the senses of those who still live, and who therefore have no means of knowing anything more by the help and activity of their organs of sense.

There is thus abundant ground for our confidence in a future life as regards man. As regards animals, if they, or some or any of them possess an immaterial principle of individuation essentially similar in nature to the human soul, then surely the souls of such animals would also survive the death of the body. But as to how this may be we know nothing, and revelation is silent. Whether in their case we may conceive of any process of metempsychosis, and possibly in some cases of a process of development in the formation of fresh living organisms, and so of new kinds and species, we can gain no real knowledge, and must remain contented with mere speculation and with hypotheses incapable of verification.

But this Aristotelian conception of matter and form as applied to the intellectual being of man carries with it some convictions which we think are not only very important but very consoling.

---

[1] See *On Truth*, pp. 487–491.

If the dog we love is the visible expression of an invisible intangible energy which is the dominant side of the living animal unity, the organization, actions and emotions of which are the creature's expression and manifestation, the same may be said of the living energy or soul of man, as in forming and constituting that at once material and immaterial entity of which it may be said to be the very essence.

That the soul of our fellow-creatures, of the men and women we like or dislike, should be imperceptible to us in and by itself is no wonder, since during the whole of life it has no existence in and by itself. Nevertheless, being as it is the dominating energy of its own compound unity, it becomes known to us through the animated body it informs. That body by its varied movements reveals it to us. In the glance of the eye, whether that glance denotes love or hatred, in the smile of affection, the sneer of contempt, the scowl of abhorence ; in the gesture of hand which it knows or repels ; in the carriage of the neck and head, and whether the latter be proudly held aloof or caressingly approximated, it is immaterial energy, or soul, which thus reveals itself, and when we think we admire or abominate the material body we can see and touch, it is the soul thus revealed which in reality attracts or repels us. That marvellous energy, which to our senses is necessarily imperceptible, reveals itself, though we may have no suspicion that such is the case, to the human being who thus feels himself attracted or repelled. It does so because the human being who is thus influenced possesses a nature essentially similar in its constitution, so that the sympathy or repulsion so often mysteriously arising between soul and soul becomes thus less difficult to understand.

Such being the relations which may arise between living men and women here and now, what may we say with regard to the soul as it exists separated from the body ?

It is common enough for persons to think they know a great deal about the soul after death. In fact, however, reason tells us hardly anything, while with respect to the *anima separata*, revelation tells us little indeed, all important as that little may be.

We cannot in the least imagine what the separated soul may be, nor what its conditions or the means and methods of its activity. The only "soul" of which we have experience—our own soul and those of other men and women—is incapable of thought without mental images—sensuous imaginations—and it cannot enjoy them without a sufficiently nourished and active brain, and it would never have formed them save by the use of the various organs of

special sense, the eye, the ear, etc. How, therefore, the soul can act intelligently without a brain and without sensuous imaginations, we cannot think.

That it can learn material things without sense-organs is incomprehensible; the thought that it should have a power of apprehending immaterial entities like itself—its own and other souls—seems less difficult for us to conceive of.

But we are apt not to notice how great is our ignorance with respect to matters of daily experience and ordinary knowledge, the, at least relative, validity of which, and its enormous importance, no one for a moment questions.

It is most true that we cannot understand *how* the soul can reason and imagine *without* a brain and organs of sense, but who understands how the soul can imagine and reason *with* them?

What is more mysterious than our perception of objects about us and their relations to us and to each other; that with some such we must become acquainted or cease to live? Surely then, however ignorant we may be as to the energies, and their modes, of the *anima separata*, we may at least feel quite certain that there is no impossibility, so far as we can see, in the soul, and by itself, being able to apprehend and appreciate other souls in a similar condition to itself.

If this reasoning is valid (and no friend we have consulted has been able to find a flaw in it), a very important and consolatory reflection follows.

It has been urged that even if a future life was a certainty, it would never give us that happiness for which all affectionate natures crave—the happiness of seeing and loving once more, beyond the grave, those beloved ones we have cherished on earth; to meet whom again in a future and happier existence is one of the prospects held out to us in heaven.

The future existence of the just who for thousands of years have done their best here below can never, it is urged, afford such a happiness, owing to the following considerations. The representations drawn out as objections have been such as the following:[1]

(1) A mother is in an agony of grief at the loss of her little girl. All her infantile winning ways, her smiles and tears, the incipient prattle of her talk, rise vividly to the mother's memory, and she tenderly dwells on the hope assured to her that in another and a better world her beloved little one will be restored to her; but it is her "little one" on which her fancy dwells so fondly that

[1] Urged, I think, in a novel, entitled *An African Farm*.

she desires to see again—not an altogether different being—whether it be a mere intangible, invisible spiritual being, such as she is utterly incapable to imagine the existence of, or even a full-grown woman in the place of the child she has lost. If it can be but one or other of these, then the future happiness her heart desires is forever denied her.

Again, let us imagine an affectionate son by the bedside of his aged and dying mother. During the twenty years he can remember her she has always been to him an old woman. As he has seen her gradual decay as senility has crept upon her, the tenderness of his affection for her has steadily increased. He loves her white hair and wrinkled face, her thin and withered hands, and the sound of a voice the tones of which speak of the many years which have crowned her honored age. As he mourns for his old mother when the end has come, a pious hope that they may meet once more naturally arises within him. But that hope and the wish to which it gives rise are that he may see his mother in very truth as he has known and loved her. His desire is to see her and not another. If that cannot be, his wish is vain, and if he is a man interested in such inquiries and speculations, he will recognize the futility of his vain hope and feel corresponding distress and discouragement.

Finally, if in the heyday of ripe youth just acquired the lover's anticipations are blighted by the sudden death of the betrothed maiden of his choice, it may be that he finds some comfort in his sore distress in the hope of a future union after his death with her whom he loved so tenderly. As he allows this aspiration to fill his mind and occupy his thoughts, it is inevitable that his imagination should call up before his mind's eye a mental picture of the loved one in the days of their brief but happy past. He sees the graceful outline of her form, her slender neck, her well-turned arm. He seems to clasp her hand again, and as she turns to him her face with its bright living eyes, he notes its sweet smile and how her head is clothed with its abundant tresses of his favorite hue. As he has known her so, and not otherwise, does he desire to behold her once more. No immaterial intelligence, no body made mature and other than this he so well knew can possibly seem capable of adequately responding to his aspirations. It may not unlikely seem to him that the holding out a hope of future reunion, but not with her he had known and as he knew her, was little else than an empty promise, if not a bitter mockery.

Such considerations as these may well, until they have been deeply pondered over, seem to deprive the conception of a future of all value, if not of all reasonable probability.

And yet these reflections which were earlier brought forward in this paper, may well, it seems to me, from the point of view of pure and simple reason only, both justify our hope of future union with those we love and also give to that hope a fully satisfying character.

For, bearing in mind the inconceivability for us of how the compound unity of soul and body enables us to perceive our fellow-creatures, of like compound nature, now, and the non-existence of any evidence that the soul in its simplicity (when it has become separated from its bodily union) cannot hereafter apprehend other souls like itself, a more important and consolatory consequence follows. For we have recognized the fact that in the complex unity of creatures (men and animals) during bodily life it is the immaterial principle which is determining, dominant, active and is indeed the living creature (man or animal) *par excellence* as compared with that in it which our senses can perceive—as compared with the body. We recognize that it is at once the source and the explanation of those powerful and often sudden attractions felt by one human being for another. If then, the soul in its disembodied condition can perceive and apprehend other souls similarly conditioned, it must be able to perceive the very essence of the soul thus made known. If it can thus recognize a loved one once lost, it must perceive that which constituted that being its very self; that which penetrating as it were through the corporeal being recognized by the senses had given to that corporeal being its special charm and those several characters upon which not our senses, but our intellect and our higher emotions, through the means or agency of our senses, had dwelt with friendship, it may have been with love, it may have been with rapture. Is it credible that a being thus able to apprehend directly that which gave the loved material form its very charm should grieve for, or desire to perceive again, those mere material envelopes, that imperfectly developed, or faded, or soon fading, fleshy constituent of the being whose soul it is which has been really prized and loved, although it may have been quite unknowingly.

It is, indeed, constantly apprehended unknowingly or altogether ignored, the many not recognizing that in the material conditions—the bodily organism—appreciable by sight and touch, there is revealed to the intellect that which is altogether beyond sense, though it is only by the medium of sense-impression that it can ever come to be known to living human beings.

How far-reaching, then, are the results, if we have judged them rightly, of the sagacious speculations of the Macedonian sage

(who lived in the fourth century before Christ) with respect to matter and form and the essential natures of living creatures. Little could he have suspected the utility to tender, pious human sentiment with regard to a future life, of views emitted by him solely in his efforts how best to understand and explain the facts and phenomena of animated nature.

I have purposely refrained, in the present paper, from putting forward any consideration, or urging any arguments which need for their support anything more than the light of reason unsupplemented by revelation. And this light carries us far, and the truths revealed by it to the tutor of Alexander the Great appear all that, in the main, will be attained by vision in the ages yet to come, since nothing essentially valuable has been discovered by any of those thinkers who deserted the peripatetic philosophy at the epoch of the renaissance. True indeed, I believe, were the words addressed to me, when but a lad, by that most eminent anatomist, the late Sir Richard Owen. He said, "I do not think that in philosophy the human mind will ever get much beyond Aristotle." And an augmented appreciation of, and a more or less marked return to, the peripatetic philosophy are amongst the most noticeable phenomena of our day. My valued friend, Mgr. Mercier, Director of the Superior Institute of Philosophy at the University of Louvain,[1] has quite recently expressed his confidence in the growth of this revival and shows how admirably it responds to the needs of modern science, especially that of physiological psychology, with respect to which he quotes[2] the following very remarkable words of the founder of the Leipzig laboratory: "Les résultats de mes travaux, dit Wundt, ne cadrent ni avec l'hypothèse materialiste, ni avec le dualisme, platonicien ou cartésien; seul l'animisme aristotélien, qui rattache la psycholgie à la biologie, se dégage, comme conclusion metaphysique plausible, de la psychologie expérimentale."

Difficult, nay impossible, it is indeed to imagine the union of matter and form in each living organism, to conceive how they can come together and the transition from anterior unions to the one which we may be considering. But how full is nature of mysteries! What a startling revelation of the hidden nature of bodies, and of the imperfection of common notions concerning them, has been the discovery of the Röntgen rays! Let them teach us to distrust first impressions and never to reject concep-

---

[1] See his *Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine*, J. Alcan, Paris.

[2] P. 455.

tions recommended to us by the highest philosophy yet attained, on account of difficulties we may experience in trying to bring them home to an imagination which, like our own, is bound down by the phenomena of sense.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

---

## SAVONAROLA.

IN the study of a Dominican Father in Vienna there hung, not so many years ago, three Florentine pictures—the execution of Girolamo Savonarola on the Piazza Signoria, the Crucifixion scene, copied from Fra Angelico's in the chapter-room of the Convent of San Marco, and an engraving of the Last Judgment painted by the same artist for the Camaldolese Church of the Angels. One day a friend entered the apartment, and standing before this group of pictures remarked: "What a curious combination you have here! And yet, one not without its significancy. The first, the execution of Savonarola, is the judgment of man on man; the second, the Crucifixion of Christ, expresses the judgment of man on God; the third, the Last Judgment, follows well upon the other two, for it represents the judgment of God on man —on man's judgment. By it everything will be set aright and will be shown in the clear certain light of its fixed and proper value."

And so it will be with Savonarola. Not until then, we dare say, with Pius VII., will his remarkable stature be shown in its true proportions. Meanwhile men contend among themselves, and such is the magic of his name that at its mere mention opposing armies are conjured up, as it were, to throw themselves headlong into the lists of champion or antagonist. Perhaps no other character in the world's history has been the occasion of so much conflict of opinion as this poor friar who, clad in the coarse gown of serge, walked amid the splendor and effeminacy of luxurious Florence, fearless, terrible, and in morals far, far above reproach. Even to-day, though four hundred years have passed since his death, feeling runs just as high for and against him. Germany, led by the perhaps hypercritical Pastor, brands him a fanatic, a sort of monstrosity begotten by an unbridled zeal and an over-

weening pride. Italy, following the lines of Capecelatro, Luotto and Ferretti, places the martyr's palm in his hand and breathes his name with all the awe and reverence that the mention of St. Francis, St. Philip Neri, or St. Catherine of Sienna engenders. Protestants like to hold with the exquisite and world-wise Dean Farrar that the Prior of San Marco was in word and deed a harbinger of the Reformation. Catholics laugh this idea to scorn, remembering how humbly and gratefully he received the plenary indulgence "inarticulo mortis" conferred on him by the papal commissary, even on his way to the scaffold.

And so this diversity will run on even to the end. But between these two extremes there is a middle ground that offers a secure foothold from which the great figure may be viewed with all its lights and shadows full upon it. Faults there were in Savonarola's make-up. It were the sheerest folly to dispute this. He was a man and not an angel. But no one who brings to the study of his character an open mind free from all prejudice can fail to receive the conviction that he was a man more sinned against than sinning. He was born into troublous times. It was an age marked by all the characteristics of unrest, looseness and confusion that distinguish periods of transition. The world was passing out of the severer cycles of the middle age into the free, highly-colored epoch of the Renaissance. There were inventions and discoveries that were far-reaching in their influence. The conservative mind of the past became unchecked. The future opened out in limitless possibilites. The present was stirred to its depths by a new spirit that walked abroad and took on itself the posture and mien of classic antiquity. It was not indeed a new spirit. It was the old one which had vanished into thin air, as the sweet and wholesome breath of Christianity had begun to play upon the art and literature of Greece and Rome. For many years it had ceased to be or at least it lay numb, impotent, death-like. But now, somehow it had shaken off its torpor and, quickened again into life, began to exert its magic influence. It brought much, very much, that was good, but, alas! much also that was bad. While the movement remained subject, or at least was guided by the benign and wise direction of the Church, it was productive of results which even in this our day are an inspiration and a stimulus to the artistic soul. This was the Christian, the true, re-birth of art and letters which received its first impulse from such mighty men as Dante and Petrarch. But it had its checks and balances, as indeed all well-regulated movements must have. Under these safeguards artists and men of letters soon

began to chafe, and it was not long before all restraint was brushed aside in order, as they claimed, to allow their genius the luxury of an unfettered flight. This flight it took, but in the mad frenzy of its soaring it broke its pinions and fell, and lay like a huge carrion upon the fair land of Italy. Florence most of all seemed infected with its noxiousness. The unclean writings of Valla, Poggio, and Beccadelli were read everywhere.

So foul and shameless were they that the moral sensibilities of an average American of this century, though he be without the least religion, would be inexpressibly shocked by their perusal. Yet in Florence, at that time, they were learned and conned by rote, declaimed on the streets into the very ears of young girls, lisped by children and applauded by those who should have been the guardians of virtue and the chastisers of vice.

Of the Republican character of Florence there was little left. The Medici, gifted with remarkable shrewdness, with an insatiable ambition and with boundless wealth, had succeeded in bringing into their hands all the reins of government. They had studied the philosophy of history well, and, knowing that a debauched people is one easy to control, they took the upper hand in spreading the poison of immorality, gave to their subjects absolute freedom in the indulgence of their passions, and even encouraged a sort of emulation among them as to who could be the most shameless of the shameless. Nay, they walked before them in this way of licentiousness and excess, and wrote carnival songs couched in words that ought to bring a blush of shame to the cheek of the lewdest. But they forgot that, while it is true that a debauched people is one easy to control, such a people is always hurrying on to its utter ruin, and when it falls it drags its princes with it into the abyss.

In the midst of this state of affairs Savonarola came to Florence. He was just thirty years of age. Seven of these years had he spent in the austerities of Dominican life—in praying, in fasting, in study. The sense of the hollowness of all earthly things, which he had at first felt in all its fulness, when, as a youth of twenty-two summers, he heard the penitential sermon of the Augustinian monk at Faenza, had not abated under this régime. On the contrary, it had grown stronger and stronger, as, buried in the silence of the cloister, he gave himself up to the contemplation of heavenly things and the study of his beloved St. Thomas. As his detachment from earthly things grew stronger and stronger his horror of sin became the more intense. Into the peace and quietness of his cell, at St. Mark's, the ribald songs and the ob-

scene jests and the drunken clamors of Florentines obtruded themselves and jarred harshly on the calm of the cloistral atmosphere, an atmosphere still sanctified by the memory of St. Antoninus. From the walls of all the cells of the convent the heavenly figures of Fra Angelico's saints preached in voiceless but irresistible eloquence of the beauty and happiness of the world to come, and of the vanity and danger of that life with which the Florentines were dulling the edge of their better sensibilities. His perfect observance of the rule, his austerities, his gentle manners, his studious habits, all won for him the love and esteem of his fellow-religious. But now the apostolic faith of Dominican life began to attract him. His great soul burned within him as he reflected upon the depths of immorality into which Florence had sunk. He felt within him the stirrings of a mighty power; and he went forth, and from the pulpit of San Lorenzo preached his first sermon against the unbridled worship of Pagan ideals in literature and art, against the indecency and shamelessness so rampant that it befouled the very air of the city. Everywhere were godlessness, sin and corruption, and against this dark and forbidding background Savonarola's striking figure was thrown into bold relief.

He preached earnestly, untiringly, almost fiercely, but success attended not his efforts. The very fire of his delivery told against him. It seemed overdrawn, and, of course, his sharp invective, his hasty and graceless gestures and his Lombard accent were not after the manner which alone was pleasing to the polished Florentines. But he was not disheartened, With renewed energy he devoted himself to the study of Scripture, especially to the Prophets in the Old Testament and to the Apocalypse in the New. From these he hoped to borrow figures that would appal or encourage, and modes of speech that would rivet the attention of his hearers.

Meanwhile he preached in other places, but it was not until the year 1490 that he was again heard in Florence. On the first of August of that year he delivered from the pulpit of St. Mark's an exposition of the Apocalypse which was overwhelmingly successful. He had caught the popular favor, and at last the hour of his strength and influence had struck. On every tongue was his name, and so vast were the crowds that thronged to hear him that the church of St. Mark's was found too small to hold them, and the great cathedral had to be secured. Even this spacious edifice proved inadequate, and many tribunes had to be erected to accommodate the multitude that assembled to hear him. Savonarola

was in an ecstacy of delight. Not indeed on account of the consciousness that he had become the hero of the hour, the fashion of the fastidious, but because he felt that the opportunity for which he had long been praying, and for which he had been preparing himself by study and meditation and fasting, was now at hand. Now that he had secured a hearing, he could show his townsmen the evil of the ways they were treading, the wanton recklessness with which they were endangering the salvation of their immortal souls, and the awful chastisement which a just God must ere long send down upon their offending heads.

During the Lent of the following year, 1491, he preached at the Cathedral a series of sermons that held his hearers spellbound. Disdaining all the embellishments of rhetoric, he poured out his soul in simple, forceful words, denouncing the sin and the shame in which their lives were spent, and foreshadowing with the mien of a prophet, if not with the mission of one, their impending destruction. Fear seized upon his hearers, and often his preaching was interrupted by the wailing and sobbing of those in whose breasts he had enkindled the cleansing flames of penitence. He was no respecter of persons. All who deserved it felt the lash of his bitter words. Neither Prince nor Pope was spared. And so he continued in his great apostolate of reform, leading sinners from the paths of vice, turning their faces to God and filling their hearts with a desire for things eternal. Gradually they became weaned from their old corrupt tastes, and, as an earnest of their eagerness to lead clean, holy lives, they brought to the Piazza San Marco impure pictures, gorgeous apparel, perfumes, musical instruments, obscene books and all the other vanities that had held them enthralled, and making one vast pile of them set it afire, and as the flames ascended to heaven they sent forth their prayers for strength thereafter to lead lives of holiness and purity, such lives as would accord with the teaching of the zealous friar of St. Mark's. Such was the change that Savonarola wrought in the hearts of the Florentines.

Nor was he less assiduous in bringing about a better state of things in religious houses. Scarcely had he been elected prior of St. Mark's when he set about instituting a thorough reform, and with such success were his efforts crowned that before many months he saw about him in full vigor the beautiful fervor of the Order's earlier years. The charm exercised by the holy friars of St. Mark's was so great that their example was followed by the neighboring convents of Fiesole, Pisa, Prato and Siena, and thus was formed the famous congregation of St. Mark's. Under the

priorship of Savonarola the community of the convent of St. Mark's increased so rapidly that it soon numbered 230 members. Sons of the best families of Florence, men of age and station, scholars, artists, all begged for admission into the Order, and even the Camaldolese of the monastery of the Angels asked for the Dominican habit that they might have the happiness of living under Savonarola's direction. Indeed he had become a power, and his influence was wielded only for the good of his fellow-townsmen. To uplift the morals of the laity and to awaken in the breasts of the clergy a full appreciation of the high estate to which they had been called was the sole purpose of his striving. Commensurately with his influence and power grew the number of his enemies. As they saw their numbers increasing they became emboldened in their determination to silence this sharp-tongued preacher. They were not without good leverage, for in his sermons, as we have seen, he had spared neither Prince nor Pope, and in his vehemence of speech had made utterances which could be used strongly against him. Besides he had become almost hopelessly entangled in the mesh of political confusion. Lorenzo had closed his eyes forever on the gay scene through which he had walked with such magnificence. His son Piero was like his father in love of pomp and power, but had not his gifts of mind nor his diplomatic shrewdness. He was hot-headed, self-willed and sadly lacking in courage. The reign of the Medici was doomed.

In his threats of chastisement, Savonarola had often proclaimed the advent of another Cyrus, who would cross the Alps with his avenging army, and brandishing the sword of God's wrath would bring the Italians to a realization of their godless state, depose the Pope and open a new era of purity and plenty for all the land. As if in verification of his prophecy, Charles VIII., King of the French, came with an army of many thousands across the Alps down into Italy. Naples was his objective-point, and the adjustment of some complications in regard to its throne his aim, but he slighted not other Italian cities that lay by the way. That Savonarola felt himself gifted with a spirit of prophecy no one can deny. His deep study of the prophets of the Old Testament seemed to confirm this opinion of himself, as it certainly gave him a prophetic manner and mode of speech. Now that the Cyrus whose advent he had so often foretold was at the very frontiers of Italy, he seemed to have the corroboration of heaven as to his extraordinary mission. It was not well for him that this coincidence came. It robbed him of his better judgment, and he committed the fatal blunder of making overtures to Charles, and per-

haps even inviting his descent upon Florence. The great end of his life was the amelioration of the political condition of Florence and the purification of its morals. In the invasion of the French army he saw a means to this end, and he hailed it with all the intensity of his intense nature. It was a woful mistake, but not an act of treachery as it has sometimes been stigmatized, for all through the period of reconstruction subsequent to the expulsion of Piero de Medici, it was evident that Savonarola was not laboring for self-advancement, but solely for his countrymen, whom he loved passionately, tenderly. From the mixture of Theocracy and Democracy of which the Florentine government was now composed he had hoped for much for the good of the people. But he was now being brought in direct contact with the Holy See, and that series of acts was inaugurated for which perhaps more than for anything else he has been blamed by posterity. Many enemies he had at Rome, and they were not idle there. The Arrabiati of Florence were in communication with these, and on the 25th of July, 1495, as the first fruits of their united efforts, there came to Savonarola a brief from his holiness, Alexander VI., summoning him to Rome. It was written in a strain of gentleness, almost of paternal solicitude. To this Savonarola replied in a most deferential communication dated July the 31st, in which he admits the authority of the Pontiff, but begs to be excused from making the journey, setting forth as reasons his broken health, the length of the way, the inclemency of the weather and the number of his enemies. Not many weeks after this there came another brief from the Pope addressed to the Franciscan friars of Santa Croce. By this document Savonarola received a command not to preach until he had justified himself in Rome; furthermore, the union of the Tuscan and the Lombard Dominicans was ordered, though the separation of these two provinces had been made by the express command of Alexander himself. Despite Savonarola's entreaties, the Pope persisted in his command forbidding him to preach, but withdrew his order for a union of the two provinces. Savonarola disobeyed this command when, in the following February, he again mounted the pulpit and began a course of Lenten sermons. True, this was done by the positive order of the Signoria, who demanded of him with threats of punishment that he again preach to the people. It was, nevertheless, a flagrant act of disobedience, and cannot be justified. By way of extenuation one might plead the intelligence received from the cardinals of Naples and Perugia to the effect that the Pope had confessed that his command of silence was due to the influence of wicked

men. It is said that when Alexander heard that Savonarola had preached only after having been commanded to do so under penalty by the Signoria, he offered him, in a spirit of conciliation, the cardinal's hat, which, however, was promptly declined.

Affairs went on from bad to worse, with party feeling running high and recrimination following upon recrimination, until on the 12th of May, 1497, Alexander VI. signed the brief of excommunication, which was published on the 18th of June of that year. Promptly did Savonarola declare the excommunication null and void, but he refrained from the exercise of all spiritual function until the following Christmas, when he read three masses and gave Holy Communion to some of his own brethren and to many of the laity. In the following Lent he again preached to the public, and in his sermons strove to justify his conduct by declaring that the excommunication was not of binding force. Exactly upon what ground Savonarola stood in his stout maintenance that the excommunication was invalid has not come down to us. True, we know that he claimed that both the order not to preach and the one commanding the congregation of St. Mark's to unite with the Roman province were against charity and therefore null and void. But it is not unlikely that with his great knowledge of Canon Law he stood upon some more technical ground; such, perhaps, has been recently held by Giovani Lottini, an Italian Dominican, and which we append for the consideration of our readers.

The last brief of Alexander VI., it will be observed, was merely a declarative one. No sentence of excommunication was fulminated in it, but rather the excommunication of Savonarola was assumed. It was not addressed to him but to a number of religious, directing them to declare to the public that he was in a state of excommunication on account of the transgression of a precept to which a sentence of excommunication (*latæ sententiæ*) was annexed.

Surely he was not excommunicated on the ground of preaching heretical doctrine, for Alexander VI. himself declared to Bonsi, the Florentine orator, that he did not condemn the doctrine of Savonarola.[1] As to his command to come at once to Rome, the reasons given for his failure to do so seemed quite satisfactory to the Pope.[2] Besides there is nothing said of excommunication or suspension in connection with this. It was given merely in virtue of holy obedience. Note the words of the precept, dated July 25, 1495: "In virtue of holy obedience, we exhort and

[1] Gherardi, p. 209.

[2] Luotto, ii., *Vere Savonarola*, p. 440.

command you to come to Rome as soon as possible, in order that we may greet you with paternal love and charity."[1] Nor was the injunction to suspend his preaching given under pain of censure.[2] It appears, therefore, that the supposition that he had incurred excommunication was based on some other transgression. One other remains, and that is his expressed disagreement with the wish of the Pontiff concerning the formation of the Tusco-Roman Congregation ordered in the papal brief, dated November 7, 1496. And it is safe to state that even this charge cannot be brought against him. The words of the brief are as follows: "In virtue of holy obedience, we unconditionally command under pain of excommunication (*latæ sententiæ*), that no person of whatsoever condition, dignity or grade, in no manner, either by himself or by others, directly or indirectly under any pretext whatsoever, shall dare to contradict or place obstacles to these letters."

It is difficult, if not impossible, to show satisfactorily that Savonarola placed obstacles in the way of those letters. That he did not approve of the object is clear, for he stated the fact openly, and his reasons were good. By the command of the Pope had the separation of St. Mark's from the Lombard province been made. Beginning with himself, Savonarola at once inaugurated a reform which soon restored the early fervor of the Order. We have seen how this fervor spread even to other houses and how, under its heavenly influence, the congregation of St. Mark's grew apace in numbers, in holiness and influence. Now that all this had been accomplished he could not desire or even accede to a union with another province the members of which showed no disposition to conform to the observant lives of the members of St. Mark's. The truth stared him in the face that laxity is vastly more infectious than rigor and austerity are enticing. Still he made no decided opposition to the wish of the holy father. He left the matter to the members of the congregation, and when they had unanimously expressed their disinclination to the union, he sent the word to the Pope with a comment that he could not blame them for holding this view of the matter, and that he fully agreed with them. Surely this was not placing an obstacle to the union. If it was, then not only he but all the brethren placed obstacles. And we ask, if all placed obstacles why were not all (*ipso facto*) excommunicated? Why should the incurring of the sentence be confined to Savonarola, when he had offended only as the others had? And surely no one ever yet supposed that any but he in-

[1] Villari, vol. i., p. 104.

[2] Luotto, p, 606; Gherardi, p. 390.

curred the excommunication. Besides, had he been disposed to place obstacles in the way or to delay or impede the fulfillment of the Pope's desire, a destruction of the brief could have been easily affected. It came to him personally. No one knew that it had been received until he laid its contents before the community. He might have withheld it, and though another would doubtless have been sent, still it would have occasioned a lapse of many weeks, and God only knows what turn events might have taken in those weeks of stirring times. To summarize then, Lottin's holding is this, that the last brief was merely declarative, that it imposed no sentence of excommunication, but presupposed one that had been incurred by the violation of a precept to which excommunication was annexed; that no such precept had been violated by Savonarola, and that consequently he had never been excommunicated.[1]

One more charge remains, one which is often brought against Savonarola especially in this our own day. Protestants love to call him a harbinger of the Reformation, and in order to proclaim this to the world in ineffaceable characters, they have placed his figure with Wyckliffe and Huss at the base of the Luther monument at Worms. So thoroughly has this charge been refuted by Father Proctor, the Provincial of the English Dominicans, in his reply to Dean Farrar entitled "Savonarola and the Reformation," and within such easy reach of all does this pamphlet lie, that we shall not now tax the patience of our readers by doing indifferently what has already been done so well.

On the 23d of May of this year of our Lord 1898, it was just 400 years since Savonarola with his two companions was strangled on the Piazza Signoria, his body burned, and his ashes thrown into the Arno. They who did this deed hoped thus to bury his memory in oblivion, but to-day there is not a stranger in Florence to whom the murmuring stream does not tell of the treasure that it holds, nor is there a footfall on the Piazza Signoria that does not linger at the spot where hungry flames once devoured the chaste temple of a mighty soul. From the beginning unto the end his was a life given to God, and when his burning zeal o'erleaped itself, and he fell amid the jeers of those whose best interests he would serve, it surely was not held against him by One who searches all hearts and who knows the inner springs of every act and thought and word.

ALBERT REINHART, O. P.

---

[1] Il Rosario; Domenica III. di Maggio, 1898.

## THE IRISH PATRIOT PRIESTS OF 1798.

THE rigors of persecution for conscience' sake had been relaxed. It was no longer the Ireland of the penal days. The priest-hunter's occupation was gone; the hedge-school philomath was allowed to guide in peace his pupils across the *pons asinorum.*

The Catholics, whom, only forty years previously, when priests were indicted for saying Mass, "the law did not presume to exist in Ireland," were tolerated, even encouraged. For about twenty years (since 1778) their sincere and indefatigable champion in Parliament, Luke Gardiner, Privy Councillor and Colonel of the Dublin Militia, occasionally reinforced by Sir Hercules Langrishe, Henry Grattan, and others, had been pounding the barricades of bigotry in their behalf. For nigh thirty years (since 1770) they had formed committees, headed by their chief prelates, to go up to each viceroy on his arrival, assure him of their devoted loyalty to the British Crown, and entreat certain concessions, which concessions were subsequently fought over by opposite factions in Parliament, who usually wound up by giving them nothing. But now they might go to Mass and send their children to school unmolested; they might vote for members of Parliament and municipal officers, though themselves debarred from sitting in either capacity; and as lawyers they were admitted to the "outer bar." To provide against the danger of foreign ideas and affiliations the British Government built in 1795, at an expense of $160,000, the Royal College of Maynooth, and endowed it with an annual grant of $40,000, so that Irish candidates for the Catholic priesthood might be educated at home, on condition of their taking an ironclad oath of allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain.

The wires which caused the explosion of '98 were laid years before it occurred.

A military banditti was launched upon the country, making every town and hamlet an inferno. "Even ehildren were sometimes scourged, sometimes immersed to the lips in water, to extort information from them against their parents, and concealment was punished with death." It was an awful reign of torture and terror.

The first Catholic priest to champion the cause of the persecuted people was the Rev. James Quigley (by some called O'Coigly).

He was the son of a farmer in the county Armagh, and was for some time a student in what is now the Irish College, Paris, which he left, however, on account of some differences with the heads of the establishment. He witnessed the opening scenes of the French Revolution, narrowly escaped being hanged from *la lanterne* as a supposed Royalist French priest, and returned in 1797, an impulsive and patriotic Ulsterman of 35, to Ireland, where it appears he took up his residence at Dundalk. His sympathies were immediately aroused on behalf of the persecuted Catholic peasantry of his native Armagh. Seven thousand of these were expelled from their homes by the rabid Orangemen, instigated by Dublin Castle agents, in 1795, and ordered to go "to hell or Connaught." The callous Luttrell, Lord Carhampton, was sent with a military force to "restore peace" in the district, which he did by seizing what Catholics he could and sending them to serve in the British fleet. Numbers of those who were left were arrested and prosecuted by the government on the charge of "defenderism," *i. e.*, defending their homes against the Orange burners and marauders. To the aid of these poor people went, in May, 1797, Father Quigley, as prominent member of a committee of defence to oppose the wiles of the Crown Counsel, Marcus Beresford. "They interfered only in the defence of prosecutions on the part of the Crown," says a secret government dispatch relative to this committee. "Constantly in court under the counsel employed by the prisoners, assisted them in challenges, and seemed to give general directions about the trial." Associated with Quigley in this worthy undertaking were Patrick Byrne, Alexander Lowrie and Samuel Turner. The latter, a barrister of Newry, was reputed as "ruined" in his business on account of his nationalist ideas, and also as being a close friend of the patriot Lord Edward Fitzgerald, with whom he was frequently seen in Dublin. He afterwards proved a mercenary traitor. Another resident of Newry, who it appears got into the confidence of Father Quigley and afterwards enacted a Judas *rôle* in regard to him, was an Englishman named Frederick Dutton, a recipient of English secret service money.

Some months after his efforts on behalf of the poor Northerners Father Quigley went to France. Probably he was the first Catholic priest to take the oath of the United Irishmen. In Paris he administered it, it is said, to the brave young Roche, afterwards General Humbert's etat-major, hanged in Dublin after the failure of the French invasion. Some differences arose among the little Paris colony of Irish exiles; Wolfe Tone charged Quigley and Napper Tandy with "caballing" against him. Ere the petty misunder-

standing reached a head Father Quigley went to London. Thence, after some time, he started to return to France in company with Arthur O'Connor, M.P., United Irishman and nephew of the Tory Lord Longueville, his servant Leary, and Benjamin P. Binns and Allen, members of an English radical or revolutionary society. The priest, with powdered hair, and otherwise disguised, called himself at first Captain Jones and afterwards Colonel Morris; the others passed as his servants. The war between England and France made passage from one country into another extremely difficult, almost impossible. The vigilance of the custom-house officers headed them off at Whitstable. Hiring a cart and loading their trunks thereon they crossed the country on foot twenty-five miles to Margate, where they hoped to get shipping; but here, in the "King's Head" inn, they were all arrested by a posse headed by the Bow Street runners, Fugin and Rivet, who had followed them from London. Thither they were escorted back, and, after being examined two or three successive days before the English Privy Council, they were committed to the Tower. In May, 1798, they were taken to Maidstone and put on trial before a special commission headed by Judge Buller. A singular document was produced, purporting to be an address from the revolutionary executive directory of England to that of France, inviting the invasion of England and referring to Father Quigley as "the worthy citizen whom they had lately seen." It was charged that the document had been found in the pocket of a greatcoat belonging to some member of the party, that the said greatcoat had some powder marks on the collar, that Father Quigley wore powder in his hair, *ergo*, that the document was his. And then came the already mentioned Fred Dutton, brought over from Newry, to swear that the handwriting in the incriminating document was that of Father Quigley. The plot of the English government or its agents against the life of the dangerous Irish clergyman was complete. He was offered life and liberty on condition that he made disclosures; those offers he spurned with contempt.

In vain the amazed priest protested his ignorance of the document; in vain he said, in reference to the statement that it was found in his pocket, "I declare most solemnly, in the face of my country and my God, that it is false, unless one of them, or some person unknown to me, placed it there." Father Quigley's four companions were acquitted, but from the doom so cunningly woven around him there was no escaping. He was sentenced to be hanged.

From Maidstone jail, about 11 o'clock on June 7, 1798, set out the death procession. Three horses drew slowly along a "hurdle" consisting of a large deal chest, with two boards for seats placed across it. On the front seat was the hangman; on the rear one Father Quigley. The victim's arms were bound, and an iron chain, fastened around his waist, secured him to the plank on which he was sitting. His shirt collar was open; a rope was thrown around his shoulders. Behind came the deputy-sheriff and an English Catholic clergyman named Griffiths, and the escort consisted of 200 of the Maidstone Volunteers. A halt was made under a gallows which had been erected on Pennenden heath, and there, in the presence of a pitiless mob, while summer smiled on the vaunted pleasant vales of Kent, the first of the sacrificed Irish soggarths of 1798 met his death with manly bearing and noble fortitude. After Father Quigley's body was cut down a surgeon completed the sentence of the law by cutting off the head. The mutilated remains were interred on the spot, and the grave is now unnoted, unknown, undiscoverable.

There is little doubt that the execution of Quigley was a typical judicial murder of the kind usually practised by England on Irish Nationalists.

Arthur O'Connor declared that the paper upon which conviction was based was placed in the victim's pocket by the police. Dutton, the informer, continued to act for and receive his blood-money; his name appears on the secret service money lists for various sums aggregating to £700, or about $3500.

Many years after Father Quigley's death Commissioner Adam Low, of the Jury Court of Scotland, who had been one of the Crown counsel at the trial, declared that the prisoner had not been properly defended. The Scotch lawyer and political turncoat, Sir James Mackintosh, having spoken disparagingly of Quigley as "the rebel Irish priest," was thus scathingly rebuked in public by the celebrated Dr. Parr: "The man might have been worse, Jemmy, than you have described him. He was an Irishman—he might have been a Scotchman; he was a priest—he might have been a lawyer; he was a rebel—but he might have been a renegade."

The insurrection burst forth in Ireland on the fatal 23d of May, 1798. The agony of the unhappy people had become unendurable. They were tired of being robbed and flogged and picketed and pitchcapped. They were mad at the shrieks of outraged virtue, at the cries of children under the lash, at the sight of burning homesteads, at the general fearful atrocities that were making

hell all around them. They stopped and burned the stage-coaches—this was the signal of uprising—then, with their rude pikes and pitchforks, they rushed upon the well-armed soldiery, and numbers of them found in death prompt relief from the prevailing horrors. And when the news of the outbreak, of the successful progress of his plans, reached Minister Pitt in London, he is said to have gloatingly exclaimed: "The Union is mine!"

But Pitt's butchers had not all their own way. From Kildare, where the uprising was initiated, the news of it, "running as it were with the wind," reached the county of Wexford. This county was but imperfectly organized under the United Irish system; in fact, a writer of the period states that the United Irishmen were "comparatively fewer in this than in any other county of Ireland." But many of the people, with a vague idea of protection against the savage yeomanry, had secretly provided themselves with arms, chiefly pikes; and these arms, on a threatening proclamation of the magistrates and by the advice of their priests —which advice some of the priests afterwards heartily regretted— they now proceeded to surrender. If a man had no pike or other weapon he would buy, beg or steal one in order to give it up and so prove his loyalty, and save himself from the lash, prison or rope. On Saturday, May 26th, the peasantry of Boolavogue, going to Ferns to surrender their arms, were treacherously set upon by double their number of the "black mob," as they called the Orange yeoman. Retreating homeward in tolerable order, they met, at Milltown, late that afternoon, a sturdy little horseman in clerical garb, who had ridden up on hearing of the affray. This was their pastor, the Rev. John Murphy, acting coadjutor of the parish of Monageer, Doctor of Divinity of the College of Seville, strong of mind and body, having alike proved himself a scholar of very high attainments and the best handball-player in the parish. He heard their tale of wrong and outrage; he saw the flames of twenty homesteads, fired by the yeomen, flaring in various directions; he saw the circle of stalwart men, of weeping women and children; and then and there he made up his mind, and the priest became an Irish insurgent leader. He designed and acted promptly. The surrounding country was being daily scoured and ravaged by the Camolin yeoman cavalry, who nightly returned to Camolin Park, the residence of their colonel, Lord Mountnorris. But this night many of them failed to return; instead there were more unwelcome visitors; for Father Murphy's band, armed with pitchforks, scythes and fowling-pieces, ambushed and attacked them as they were returning from "the Harrow," a

village two miles northwest of Boolavogue, defeated them with slaughter, slaying among others their leader, Lieutenant Bookey, and two hours later took Camolin Park, capturing therein a quantity of arms which had been given up by the country people, and, better still, a number of new carbines which Mountnorris had provided for his corps. Father John Redmond, a loyalist Catholic curate, interfered to protect the mansion of Mountnorris from plunder or injury, for which service he afterwards received from the "noble lord" the poorest possible reward.

Whit-Sunday morning broke, but there was no Mass in Father Murphy's little chapel, for the yeoman came and gave it to the flames, as also the house where he lodged—for he had none of his own. As for the priest, he took post on Oulart Hill, seven miles due east of Enniscorthy and eleven miles north of Wexford town, at the head of three or four thousand of his parishioners, among whom were many women and children and aged and infirm. He had only about three hundred fighting men, few of them equipped with firearms. In the early afternoon a red-coated column was seen advancing from the south, across the summit of Boloobwee hill. It was the ferocious North Cork militia—about 110 of the pick of them—under Lieutenant-Colonel Foote and Major Lombard, and the Shelmalier cavalry, probably that many more sabres. The cavalry shot out to encircle the hill so as to cut off the retreat of the insurgents, who were posted behind a ditch on the summit. The infantry charged up the slope, just halting to deliver a volley at what seemed a row of men's heads looking over the hedge, but which were merely fire-decoying hats raised on pikes. Several soldiers fell. Major Lombard lay dead with a ball through his heart. Then, leaping the ditch, came an avalanche of about two hundred pikemen, who spared not the steel nor the pursuit till of the whole North Cork detachment there were left alive but the lieutenant-colonel, a sergeant, a drummer and two privates, who saved their lives by good, hard running, the last of the fugitives being piked more than a mile from where the red-coated column was first sighted. As for the cavalry, they waited only till one of their number was tumbled from his saddle by a bullet from a long-barreled strand gun; they then turned tail and fled at top speed. It was pike against musket, and pike had won; and the priest-general, smiling with victory, stood amidst his cheering army. Of the enemy over a hundred lay dead, including six officers. The insurgent loss was three killed and six wounded. The victory of Oulart Hill was practically the beginning of the Irish insurrection of 1798.

Promptly following up his victory, Father John, at the head of a largely increased force, next day attacked the enemy in Enniscorthy, and captured the place after employing the expedient of having his pikemen drive before them a herd of cattle, which broke the enemy's line and threw it into confusion. Soon afterwards the insurgent camp was formed on Vinegar Hill, a rocky eminence overlooking the town. Thenceforth by his inspiring presence and splendid example he was the life and soul of the patriot army. With his valor he combined cool and discreet generalship. He advised against the attack on Arklow; his advice was disregarded and the result was disaster. When, after the battle of Vinegar Hill, all seemed lost for the insurgents, he still kept the green flag flying and advised his brother priest, Father Roche, against the fatal folly of surrendering to the merciless redcoats. "Even if I stood alone," he declared, "I would never willingly surrender to them." Unable to dissuade his friend he broke up his bivouac on the Three Rocks, near Wexford town, and marched with his force through Scollagh-gap into the county of Carlow, routing a party of the enemy that disputed the way. In the street of Killedmond a strong body of cavalry and infantry gave battle, but these the brave Wexfordmen, although fatigued from a long day's march, quickly overthrew and chased through the blazing village. Next day they encountered a British force which sought, at Goresbridge, to defend the passage of the Barrow; but the furious charge of the Fourth Dragoon Guards was promptly stayed and repulsed by Father John's pikemen, twenty-eight of the Wexford militia were made prisoners, and the rest of the redcoats fled. They rested that night on a high mountain land known as the Ridge of Leinster, and early next morning, June 24th, advanced towards Castlecomer, which they captured, a strong British force which advanced towards the place retiring precipitately without daring to give serious battle.

Kilkenny was apathetic in the national cause; so was Queen's County; seeing which Father John's brave army turned back in disappointment. As they rested in the Kilkenny coal district, the colliers—an emaciated, consumptive, degraded crew—came and pretended to fraternize with them; but at night, while the brave fellows slept, the soulless wretches stole a large quantity of their arms and ammunition and disappeared like moles into their burrows. In consequence of this treacherous act and of a fog which concealed the approach of the enemy the Wexfordmen were defeated, on the morning of the 26th, at Kilcomney Hill. Retreating, however, in good order, they carried Scollagh-gap, which was held by the

enemy, by a pike charge, and marched back through it into their native county, where, at length despairing of success, they finally dispersed to their homes.

Father John fell into the hands of his mortal foes. His martyrdom for the religious and political faith that was in him took place in the town of Tullow, county Carlow. It seems that his captors were unaware of the important nature of their prize, but the discovery of a pyx and stole in his pocket showed that the "croppy" was a priest, and this was sufficient. He was tried by court-martial. A ruffianly major named Hall proposed an insulting question; a prompt blow of the sturdy soggarth's fist sent him sprawling. The patriot priest was stripped and tied up, and received five hundred lashes, the tearing cat-o'-nine-tails passing from one tired hand to another. Then, this horrible laceration failing to kill him, or even to elicit a groan of pain, they cut off his head. His body they burned in a pitch barrel—as "a holy fricassee," they said—at the door of a respectable Catholic townsman named Callaghan, and they afterwards buried the calcined bones in the same spot. The head they placed on a fourteen-foot pole at the chapel gate, and the attention of every Catholic who passed was directed to it, with the facetious request that he "ask his priest for the forgiveness of his sins." So died the heroic John Murphy, whom victory would have made the Washington of Ireland.

Early on the memorable Whit-Sunday morning of the outbreak, the Rev. Michael Murphy, who strongly disapproved of armed resistance, considering it hopeless, set forth from the town of Gorey, where he lodged, to say Mass for his flock. But in Ballycannow, as in Boulavogue, there was no Mass said that morning. The musket-butts of Orange yeoman were crashing on altar and window, and the pastor met an alarmed party of his people, who begged him to accompany them to the hill of Kilmacthomas, nine miles west of Gorey, whither a multitude, largely composed of women and children, had fled for refuge, even as sheep instinctively seek the high ground to avoid the wolves. He went to the hill, which was soon approached by three hundred yeomen from Carnew (where two days before they had shot twenty-eight men in cold blood without any form of trial). Volley after volley was poured into the helpless crowd, which fled in terror, leaving three hundred corpses on the sward, after which the yeos proceeded on their way, burning two Catholic chapels and one hundred cabins in a march of seven miles. Father Murphy rallied and organized the fugitives, and with them joined Father John

Murphy's victorious force at Balliorrell, with which they subsequently participated in the capture of Enniscorthy.

Among the insurgents were Father Murphy's brother Nicholas and his nephew James, whom he himself induced to join. When he came to take the latter to the camp, the young man's mother protested. "Sister, it is true he is very young," replied the patriot priest, "but not too young to fight, and, if needs be, to die for his country."

After ten days' fighting, Father Michael proposed an attack on Arklow, probably for the purpose of opening up the way to Dublin and striking at tyranny in its chief stronghold. The attack, a brilliant and successful one, was made on the 7th of June. But it cost the life of the gallant leader. As the pikemen wavered under a shower of grapeshot, one of them exclaimed: "Boys, we have no one to lead us," whereupon Father Murphy dropped his riding-whip and seized a flag. "Come on, boys, I'll lead you—come on!" he cried encouragingly. Bravely leading the charge against the British right wing, he was slain, "while waving a standard in his hand," by a ball from a four-pounder. Confused by the fall of their leader, the insurgents made no use of their victory, but turned about and marched back to Gorey Hill.

Father Murphy's body lay where he had fallen, green flag in hand, until the return of the enemy, when it was perceived by a party of military under Lord Mountnorris. This doubtful scion of nobility, whose name was Arthur Anglesey, was son of Richard, Earl of Annesley, by one Juliana Donovan. He had been rejected as illegitimate by the English House of Peers, but was confirmed by the Irish Parliament in 1793 as Earl of Mountnorris. Before the outbreak he was familiar with Father Michael Murphy, who had assisted him in getting signatures of loyalty from the Catholics, of whom he was supposed to be a friend. To rid himself of the latter odious imputation, with the spirit of a pariah he directed that the head of the insurgent leader should be lopped off and the body cast into a burning house, exclaiming: "Let his body go where his soul is." It appears his order was not carried out, but more inhuman atrocities ensued. Captain Holmes, of the Durham regiment, broke open the breast with an axe, and some soldiers of a Welsh regiment, called the Ancient Britons, took out their dead enemy's heart, roasted his body, and oiled their boots with the grease that dripped from it. They also roasted his heart and devoured it! Tradition says that these cannibal savages died raving mad.

Father Murphy's sister and some friends recovered his fiend-

ishly-maltreated remains, and interred them in Castle Ellis graveyard. In the same grave were subsequently laid the remains of his young nephew James, who fell June 25th in an attack on Hacketstown.

Nicholas Murphy, a relative of Father Michael's, escaped to Canada, where he settled and prospered, one of his sons (who visited Ireland ten years ago) becoming mayor of Montreal.

At the end of May, when the insurgents lay encamped at the Three Rocks, near Wexford, they were joined by the Rev. Philip Roche, of Poulpearsey, and the Rev. Moses Kearns, both clergymen of gigantic frame and great physical strength and bravery. A force under Bagenal Harvey, a Protestant insurgent leader, with Father Roche as second in command, marched to attack the redcoats in New Ross. From the hill of Carrickbyrne this force marched, on the evening of June 4th, to Corbet Hill, within a mile of Ross, which was held by two thousand British troops, including the Dublin militia, under Lord Mountjoy, formerly Luke Gardiner, M.P., and foremost champion of the Catholic cause in the Irish Parliament. Next morning General Harvey sent forward his aide-de-camp, Furlong, with a white flag and a letter demanding the surrender of the town; but the envoy, on approaching the British outposts, was immediately shot. The assault was soon after ordered, and the Irish, under a terrific fire from the enemy, stormed the Three-Bullet Gate (Ross being then a walled town) and surged into the streets. A British officer advanced to parley with them, and, remembering the fate of Furlong, they promptly shot him. Thus, by the irony of fate, fell the staunch parliamentary champion of the Irish Catholics, for the slain officer was Lord Mountjoy. The late Dr. R. D. Joyce, who wrote "The Boys of Wexford," and the Irish Parnellites, who adopted it as their campaign song, were probably unaware of the liberal and upright character of the individual referred to in the lines:

> "A young man in our Irish ranks
> A cannon he let go;
> He slapped it into Lord Mountjoy,
> A tyrant he laid low."

In no recorded manner was poor Mountjoy a tyrant; he was a good friend of the Catholics when friends were greatly needed, and so quite unfitted for his fate.

After some hours of desperate and bloody fighting, during which the town was captured and recaptured, the losses on either side being about even, the British were left in possession of New

Ross, and the insurgents, unmolested, returned to their camp at Carrickbyrne. Three days afterwards they moved thence to Slieve Kielter, an eminence overlooking the river Barrow, where Father Roche was enthusiastically elected commander-in-chief *vice* General Harvey, resigned. Under their new commander—the clerical Ney of the insurrection—they marched to the hill of Lacken, between Ross and Enniscorthy, where, says a hostile account, "they formed their encampment with much more regularity than usual, and erected a number of tents for the accommodation of the officers." The hearty, rugged, generous disposition of Father Roche won him the love and confidence of his men, whom he inspired with his own lion-like courage and contempt of the enemy. Throughout the war his influence was ever wielded for mercy and humanity. A Protestant historian, the Rev. Mr. Gordon, says: "Two Protestants in a respectable situation of life, brothers, named Robinson, of the parish of Killegny, were seized and carried to Vinegar Hill. Some of their Roman Catholic tenants, solicitous for their safety, rode to Lacken Hill camp, where Rev. Mr. Roche held the chief command, to solicit his interference. An express was immediately forwarded to Vinegar Hill, ordering the Robinsons to be sent under escort to Lacken Hill camp. The two Robinsons got their freedom immediately, and a protection, and were permitted to return home. This being understood by some officers in the army that they had been pardoned, and by a rebel priest, was construed into disloyalty, and was nearly becoming the instrument of their own condemnation and death."

On June 19th the camp on Lacken Hill was surprised by a large force of the enemy from New Ross, and the insurgents, few in number at the time and with little or no ammunition, were in danger of annihilation. But the good generalship of their leader saved them. Roused from bed by the general alarm, he immediately issued orders for battle, but, seeing the superiority of the approaching force, he ordered his infantry to retreat as quickly as possible. Then, distributing his few horsemen at different distances across the hill, he caused them to wave banners as if in defiance, giving the British the idea of a large force ready for battle. The advancing column halted in some confusion, and began to form line of battle. Then, the insurgent foot having got to a safe distance, the horsemen galloped after them, Father Roche himself being the last man to leave the hill. Thus he brought off his entire command to the Three Rocks without the loss of a man.

Next day he fought probably the most extraordinary action of

the war. Hearing that a British force had encamped at Longraig, a village midway between Ross and Wexford, he marched with an insurgent army to give battle. The enemy consisted of one thousand two hundred well-equipped and disciplined troops, under the able and chivalrous Sir John Moore. The Bayard of the British army and the Ney of the Irish were face to face. Father Philip's artillery consisted of six small ship guns tied with ropes on common carts. His pikemen, from the manœuvres of the opposing soldiery, were unable to come into action, which was entirely sustained by the gunsmen, who numbered only five hundred and sixty. These, when the insurgents arrived at Goff's Bridge, within sight of the enemy, whose scarlet array was drawn up at Fooke's Mill, formed in line four deep, advanced, and opened fire. And for four hours those half-thousand brave fellows maintained a spirited and scientific bout with more than double their number of regular troops, ably led and thoroughly disciplined. The British troops fought better than they had done in any engagement in the insurrection except Arklow; nevertheless, they are said to have lost more men in this action than the insurgents. The latter, their stock of ammunition at length exhausted, retired leisurely towards Wexford. The old car on which one of their guns was tied was broken by falling into a ditch, and they left it and the piece there. But the other five cannon they brought back with them.

But the end was near. Three strong British armies were closing in on Wexford. On June 21st the main insurgent force marched from the Three Rocks to the village of Sledagh. Here a council of war was held, and here Father Roche, despite the advice of Father John Murphy, announced his intention of proceeding to Wexford with the view of obtaining terms from General Lake for himself and comrades. Lord Kingsborough (grandfather of the late Colonel King-Harman), who had been practically a prisoner in Wexford during the insurrection, had held out promises of protection of life and property when the town would have repassed under British rule. Relying on these assurances, the British troops having reoccupied the town, Father Roche, unarmed, rode in in the early morning. He had advanced within the lines before he was recognized, immediately upon which he was dragged from his horse by the savage yeomen, brought in the most ignominious manner to the British camp on Windmill Hill, brutally kicked and buffeted, pulled by the hair, and at length hauled down to the jail, so covered with bruises and blood as to be unrecognizable. Thus was the chivalrous soggarth requited

for the mercy and humanity he had always bestowed upon his enemies!

A few days afterwards he was tried by court-martial—the first to be condemned to death by that tribunal in Wexford. He was taken to the bridge of Wexford and hanged from an ornamental lamp-arch, springing from two wooden piers. His heavy frame caused the first rope to break, but another was procured, and his life was ended with double torture. With him was executed another insurgent leader, Captain Keough, whose head was cut off and raised on a pike over the court-house. The lifeless bodies of both were stripped, treated with barbarous indecency and thrown into the river.

A fighting soggarth of the type of Father Roche—like him a man of gigantic frame, powerful physique and lion-like courage—was Father Moses Kearns. A man of action and enterprise, too, he proposed, immediately on casting his lot with the insurgents, that an attack be made on the British forces in Newtownbarry for the purpose of opening up communication with the insurgents of Wicklow and Carlow. The proposal was adopted, and Father Kearns was appointed general of the force, about two thousand strong, armed chiefly with pikes, which moved upon the village. The rev. general, however, displayed some imprudence in his initial essay in warfare; he paid no heed to the sage suggestion of one of his men, that before commencing the attack he should send a force to the opposite side of the town in order to guard against surprise. After invoking aloud the Divine aid he gave the signal for assault, and in a short time the *élan* of the Wexford pikemen sent Colonel L'Estrange's five hundred regulars flying for their lives. The triumphant insurgents dispersed through the captured village, but here, through lack of ordinary precautions, they were soon after surprised by their late opponents, reinforced by the King's County militia, and suffered a repulse. They retired fighting bravely and inflicting considerable loss on the enemy; and a large party of them, under Father Kearns, proceeded to the insurgent camp on Vinegar Hill.

When twenty thousand British troops under the notorious "butcher general," Sir Gerard Lake, encompassed and attacked the insurgent position there on the fatal 21st of June, Father Kearns proved himself a hero. The division under himself and Thomas Barker, who had learned the art of war in the French service, took post with a small cannon mounted on a car in front of the Duffrey Gate of Enniscorthy, and successfully resisted the attempts of the English under General Johnson to enter the town

from that side. When Barker lost his arm by a ball, Father Kearns took his place and continued to animate his men until he, too, was severely wounded and had to be carried from the field.

Escaping from the sanguinary battue which ensued, Father Kearns and a large number of insurgents found a protecting fastness in the wood of Killaughrim, whence they emerged, early in July, and joined the main camp at Ballyfad. On the morning of July 5th, in a dense fog, they were surrounded by the army of the ferocious Sir James Duff; but they burst easily through the toils, slaying about eighty of his cavalry, and marched towards Carnew, halting at Cranford or Ballygullen, to fight the last battle of the insurrection in Wexford. For an hour and a half the brave men under the green flag displayed the greatest valor, repulsing Duff's cavalry and driving his artillerymen three times from their guns, all performed by the gunsmen alone. When at length the redoubtable pikemen were brought into action, General Duff, already severely worsted, withdrew his reduced force towards Gorey, and the last fight on Wexford ground lay to the credit of the gallant "croppies."

But Wexford county was now swarming with British troops that had been poured in from all parts of the three kingdoms. The madness of further resistance was evident. Numbers of the insurgents dispersed to their homes. A small body, with whom was Father Kearns and a brave Protestant patriot, Anthony Perry, of Inch, proceeded into Kildare, where they formed a junction with some local insurgents. They set out for the County Meath, where they lost many of their reduced number in an attack on the fortified house of Captain Tyrrell, at Clonard. On the following day, their ammunition exhausted, they were repulsed by the Limerick militia under Colonel Gough (father of "the Bayard of India"). Somehow separated from their men, Father Kearns and Colonel Perry fell into the hands of their enemies, and the Catholic priest and the Protestant gentleman were hanged side by side, dying cheerfully for the cause they loved. The story of their doom is thus related by O'Kelly: "Their brave leader, Colonel Perry, and the Rev. Mr. Kearns, were both met with at Clonbollogue by Captains Ridgeway and Robinson, long famed for their prejudices to papists, and the chief leaders of Orange principles in Edenderry; after being conducted to the guard-house a summary trial under the specious name of court-martial was commenced by these worthies and fomentors of persecution; the gallows was ordered to be the doom of Perry and Rev. Mr. Kearns. An apparent feeling for Perry was evinced by the Orange party,

because a Protestant; but an exulting sneer broke forth for Rev. Mr. Kearns as being a rebel priest."

When the shells were bursting on Vinegar Hill and the British cavalry charging the insurgents, a priest named Clinch, of Enniscorthy, fought bravely in the thick of the fray. Mounted and sword in hand he singled out Lord Roden, the high-priest of Orangeism in Ireland, attacked him vigorously and wounded him, and might have slain him had not one of Roden's troopers ridden up and rescued his leader by shooting his brave clerical opponent dead.

Only these five priests—the two Fathers Murphy, Fathers Roche, Kearns and Clinch—are recorded as having taken an actual part in the fighting in Wexford. Some adverse comment has been excited by the course pursued by them. Even some of the insurgents, their contemporaries, looked rather in disapproval than otherwise on the strange spectacle of priests in arms; it seemed so *outré*, so much at variance with their sacred calling. But the urgent necessity that forced them into the position, and the good they accomplished, and the evil they prevented while in it, must be considered. On this subject Thomas Cloney, an insurgent leader who fought with them shoulder to shoulder, says: "I always thought and still think that ministers of religion should be ministers of peace, and not voluntary witnesses to the spilling of human blood. It is but justice, however, to those lamented clergymen to say that they prevented much bloodshed. They were all brave, just and humane." Edward Hay, although imbued with sickly loyal prejudice against the "fighting priests," admits that "they were conspicuous for courage and humanity."

But the Irish warrior-priests of 1798 need no apologist. The shafts of Pecksniffian innuendo glance harmless from their noble characters. Their devotion to that noble cause all of them sealed with their blood. Their names deserve to be set in letters of gold on any monument with which Irishmen may commemorate glorious "Ninety-eight."

There were other clergymen, non-combatants, and even non-sympathizers, so far as the insurgent cause was concerned, who nevertheless experienced the rigors of persecution. Father John Redmond, coadjutor of the parish of Clough, was eminently loyal to the British Government—so much so that it is said he refused to hear the confessions of United Irishmen, regarding them as outside the pale of the Church. Before the insurrection he was on friendly terms with the illegitimate reprobate Lord Mountnorris, whose property at Camolin Park he took an active part in saving on the Saturday night of the outbreak—an act which proved

fatal to the unfortunate clergyman, for the wretch whose house and goods he preserved at the risk of his life argued from it that Father Redmond was a man of influence among the "rebels" and therefore worthy of death. Mountnorris sent for him to come to Gorey. On his appearing there he was brutally knocked down by some yeomen, dragged before a court-martial, and sentenced to death on the evidence of Mountnorris. He was hanged in company with an insurgent named Patrick Carroll, and both their bodies were interred in the same grave, a square weed-grown mound still pointed out on the side of Gorey Hill, facing Kilnahue lane.

Father Redmond had studied in France, where he had had the distinction of saving the life of Napoleon Bonaparte. One night he and Napoleon occupied the same chamber in a house in Bas Poictou. Next day, Napoleon, who was experimenting in machinery, tried one of his inventions in a water-course, and in doing so tumbled into the stream. Redmond extended his fowling-piece, which Napoleon seized and was drawn to *terra firma*, else Europe might never have known her great conqueror.

One of the first priests arrested in Wexford was Father Dixon. He was taken by the Orange Captain Boyd on the perjured testimony of an informer, a gardener named Francis Murphy, who swore that on a market-day, in Wexford, the clergyman met him in a public house and tried to induce him to become a United man. Three respectable witnesses contradicted this testimony, but nevertheless Father Dixon was marched off a prisoner to Duncannon Fort, under sentence of transportation. He had a relative in Wexford, a rude sea-captain named Thomas Dixon, who terribly avenged the outrage when that town passed into the hands of the insurgents. The unhappy informer having been made prisoner by the people, Captain Dixon, on the second Sunday of the rising, while the Catholic inhabitants were at Mass, brought Murphy out of the jail and led him to the Bull-ring, where he compelled three revenue officers to shoot him and afterwards to throw his corpse into the river.

Nor did the vengeance of Dixon stop here. A man of fierce and sanguinary disposition and inflamed by the butcheries committed by the yeomanry on the families of the peasantry, he determined to put to death every Orangeman in his power. On June 20th, when Father Roche's division was absent opposing Sir John Moore's force at Fooke's Mill, Dixon and a crowd of pikemen went to the jail and brought forth several of the loyalist prisoners, whom he sentenced to death on the evidence of two of their num-

ber, Orangemen. The unfortunate men were conducted to the bridge, and there such of them as were not saved by the intercession of spectators who bore testimony to their good deeds or innocence were ruthlessly piked to death and their bodies thrown into the river. A few were mercifully shot. The bodies were not rifled. Thirty-five victims were slaughtered in this appalling manner, and the dripping pikes were raised to be plunged into the body of the thirty-sixth, when this one, a Mr. Kellet, happily bethought him of summoning as witness in his favor the parish priest of Wexford, the Rev John Currin. Thus learning for the first time of the horrid work going on, Father Currin came running to the bridge. Appalled at the scene of blood, the minister of peace flung himself on his knees beside the intended victim and entreated those present to join him in prayer. Several knelt down, and the good priest in solemn and moving words supplicated the Almighty to show the same mercy to the people that they would show to the prisoners. This produced a subduing effect on the populace, and, on the intervention of some of the insurgent leaders, the slaughter ceased. Father Currin, who thus won the victory of mercy over the wild passion of revenge, was a pious Franciscan. In the grounds of the Franciscan convent of Wexford a group of trees marks the site of one, a great chestnut, which was planted by him, and which was known as Father Currin's tree. The sanguinary Captain Dixon escaped to America, where he lived many years. His relative, Father Dixon, partly the unconscious cause of his act of vengeance, was, in defiance of all justice, transported to Botany Bay.

To the penal settlement of Botany Bay were also sent other Irish priests, transported as felons on the mere suspicion that they sympathized with the unhappy oppressed against the brutal oppressor. Prominent among them was the Rev. James Harold, O.P., pastor of the parish of Saggart, County Dublin. Although to the last he had preached patience and resignation to the persecuted people he was marked out for vengeance, seized one Sunday morning at the very altar and led away to jail, whence, several months later, he was transferred to the "Minerva" convict-ship, off the coast of Cork, and taken to Australia. Another convict on the same ship was General Joseph Holt, the Wicklow insurgent leader, who describes the vessel as "a floating dungeon of disgusting filth" under a "cruel and unfeeling monster, in the shape of a man, who commanded it," adding that "many of the poor wretches on board had been eight months on the water without a change of clothes, in a state of inexpressible torment, and covered with vermin."

To those patriot Irish priests, exiled as felons, belongs the glory of founding the Catholic Church in Australia. January 15, 1800, Father Harold landed at Sydney. He soon commenced missionary work among his poor countrymen, endeavoring to console them under the persecutions to which they were subjected by the degraded and inhuman brutes who held irresponsible control of the convict settlement. Frightful were the scenes he was compelled to witness, and even to participate in. Holt describes one of them: "The unfortunate man (Fitzgerald) had his arms extended around a tree, his two wrists tied with cords, and his breast pressed slowly against the tree, so that flinching from the blows was out of the question, as it was impossible for him to stir. Father Harold was ordered to put his hands against the tree by the hands of the prisoner, and two men were appointed to flog, one being the hangman from Sydney. They stood on each side of Fitzgerald, and I never saw two threshers in a barn move their flails with more regularity than these two man-killers, unmoved by pity, and rather enjoying their horrible employment than otherwise. The first blow made the blood spurt out of Fitzgerald's shoulders. I have witnessed many horrible scenes, but this was the most appalling sight I had ever seen."

After living and laboring for many weary years amidst such sights Father Harold obtained his liberty and returned to Ireland, where he lived to a good old age, beloved and respected.

A gentle, non-belligerent priest who was arrested and subjected to the torture of the lash was Father Peter O'Neill, of Ballymacoda, County Cork. Without a shred of evidence against him he was seized at the instance of fanatic suspicion and hatred and bound to the triangle, where two stalwart soldiers laid on the strokes alternately, "cross-cutting" and taking his flesh away in lozenges. While the terrible punishment was in progress an order came for Father O'Neill's release, but the ruffianly officer who superintended ordered the laceration to continue, being satisfied only when the victim "shook the triangle" in his agony. Father O'Neill's memory is revered by the people of the district as that of a saint. His dust reposes beneath a tall, time-stained monument in Ballymacoda chapel yard, and near at hand a high Celtic cross marks the resting-place of his nephew, the patriotic Peter O'Neill Crowley, who was shot in an encounter with English troops in 1867.

P. G. Smyth.

## HAS THE CHURCH A SHARE IN DETERMINING THE SACRAMENTAL RITE?

IN the October number of "Les Études" of last year there appeared an article from the pen of the Reverend Father Stephen Harent, S.J., professor of dogmatic theology in the Lyons province of the Society of Jesus, entitled, "The Part of the Church in the Determining of the Sacramental Rite." The subject is one of the greatest interest for the theological student, and not without its attraction, one would fancy, for the general Catholic reader. It may come as a surprise to some of the latter class to hear that there can be any question of the Church having a share in determining the rite of any sacrament—understanding, of course, the essential and not the merely ceremonial and accidental rite; for in the definition of a sacrament as given by the catechism in use throughout England and Wales—a definition substantially the same as that given in other Catholic catechisms—we read: "A sacrament is an outward sign of inward grace, *instituted by Christ*, by which grace is given to our souls." The words "instituted by Christ" might seem to one, at first sight, to preclude the possibility of the Church having any part in determining the essential rite of any sacrament. This difficulty, one of the principal difficulties raised against the opinion advocated by Father Harent, will be duly considered in its proper place. For the moment, let it suffice to say that everything depends upon the precise meaning of the words "instituted by Christ." How far is it necessary to ascribe the determining of the sacramental rite to Our Lord Himself, in order that they may be truly said to have been instituted by Him? If theologians differ as to the precise nature and extent of this institution, there are some points, nevertheless, upon which they are quite unanimous. The sacraments were all instituted by Christ, and they were instituted by Him immediately. St. Thomas, in the third part of his Summa, question sixty-four, art. 4, asks himself whether Christ could have communicated to His ministers (*i.e.*, Apostles; *cf.* I Cor., iii.) the power that He had over the sacraments, so that they could of their own choice institute what sacraments they deemed necessary or suitable for the Church, and he answers the question in the affirmative, distinguishing between the power which Christ had as God and the power which He had as man. What St. Thomas considered as a mere speculative pos-

sibility St. Bonaventure and some of the older schoolmen held to have actually taken place in the case of some of the sacraments. In his treatise on Confirmation[1] the Seraphic Doctor teaches that the Sacrament of Confirmation was instituted after the ascension of Christ into heaven by the apostles themselves acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Whether or not it be true that St. Bonaventure changed his views on this matter at a later period of his life, it is now universally held by theologians that this opinion is no longer tenable since the definition of the Council of Trent, Session 7, Can. 1. "If any one say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Christ Jesus Our Lord . . . . Let him be anathema."

Although this canon does not explicitly condemn a mediate institution of the sacraments by Christ, and consequently does not make the doctrine of an immediate institution *de fide definita*, yet in the mind of the Council the words *instituted by Christ* were intended to convey the meaning of immediate institution, and consequently the doctrine of mediate institution is no longer a lawful one. But while giving us this solid foundation of truth to rest upon in our study of the sacraments, the canon of the Council of Trent still leaves much uncertainty as to the precise manner of this immediate institution, and on this point the opinions of theologians are very much at variance.

The different views in the matter may be reduced to three classes :

I. Those who teach that Our Divine Saviour instituted each and every sacrament not only "in genere," that is in a general kind of way, by indicating to His apostles what sort of matter and form He desired for each sacrament, leaving the further and more precise determination to the choice of the apostles themselves, but that He instituted each one "in specie;" that is, He decided once and for all the exact precise matter and form of each sacrament.

II. Those who agree with the first class to this extent that they hold Our Lord to have instituted certain sacraments in this specific way, as, for example, Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, but who disagree with them with regard to the other sacraments. It is their opinion that Jesus Christ in the case of some sacraments—as, for example, Confirmation and Holy Orders—left the matter and form officially undetermined, and decided that whatever rite were used by the proper minister, provided it suited the general purpose of that particular sign desired by Him, should be

[1] Lit. iv. Lev. dis. 7, qu. 1, art. 1.

valid. Thus, to take, for example, the sacrament of Confirmation, Our Lord would have said, "I institute a sacrament by which those who receive it will be, by the reception of the Holy Spirit, confirmed and strengthened in the faith. Any formula conveying this idea and used by a proper minister will be valid." In this case the share of the Church in deciding the sacramental rite would, as far as validity is concerned, be *nil.* She would, however, always retain the power in such an hypothesis of deciding what rite would be necessary for the liceity of the sacrament.

III. Those who, whilst agreeing with the first and second class, that Our Lord did actually determine "in specie" the rite of certain sacraments, hold, nevertheless, that in the case of other sacraments, notably of Confirmation and Holy Orders, Christ, whilst laying down in general the nature of the sacrament, the particular grace it was to confer, and the general character of the sign which should be used in order to signify and convey the grace conferred, did, notwithstanding, leave to His Church the power and authority to decide this sign more in particular, according to the necessities of the faithful. This sign, rite, or formula, when thus decided by the ecclesiastical authority, was to be the only valid formula for the conferring of that particular sacrament; any other formula, though possibly better calculated to signify the grace to be conferred, would be certainly invalid and useless as far as sacramental grace was concerned.

It is this latter opinion which Father Harent advocates in his article in "Les Études." I say *opinion*, for although, in exposing the different systems, I have made use of the words "hold," "teach," etc., yet each system, as far as the controverted sacraments are concerned, does not claim for itself more than the greater probability. Some of the merits of the view held by this third class of theologians are that it becomes easier for one who holds it to explain certain very great difficulties in connection with the sacraments of Holy Orders and Confirmation, and it gives one more weapon to Catholic theologians in their endeavors to prove to Anglicans the invalidity of Anglican orders. The great difficulty urged against this view is the one which we touched on briefly in the beginning, namely, the words of the first canon of the seventh session of the Council of Trent—words given also in the definition of a sacrament as found in Catholic catechisms. "How," it is said, "can this view be reconciled with the teaching of the Council that all the sacraments were instituted by Christ Jesus Our Lord?"

Father Harent answers this difficulty by giving a number of

parallel instances in which expressions similar to that used by the Council in this instance do not prevent a similiar variety of opinions. Without quoting his exact words, I shall give in substance several of the examples which he brings forward. If they do not raise this third opinion to the dignity of certitude, they establish its solid probability until the Church shall authoritatively pronounce one of the other views to be the only true one.

1. It is of faith that God is the author of the Bible, and if we consider this authorship to consist of inspiration it is of defined faith, and those who wilfully deny it are guilty of formal heresy. Yet though this much is certain, every student of Scripture is well aware how much is left undecided and uncertain with regard to the exact nature and extent of this inspiration. For example, did God dictate all the words (verbal inspiration), or did he simply inspire the substance of the thought, leaving the choice of expression to the sacred writer (material inspiration); and if so, to what extent did he leave him free to choose? These questions are left unanswered by the definition of the Church that "God has inspired the Holy Scriptures."

2. God himself instituted the Papacy. Leo XIII. holds his present position as supreme spiritual head of the Christian world by virtue of Divine authority. This, since the Vatican Council, is a dogma of defined faith. And yet Jesus Christ, whilst instituting the office of supreme pastor, left the mode of his election, nevertheless, to the decision of His Church. The laws which govern the holding of a conclave and its method of arriving at a decision are not of Divine but of ecclesiastical origin, and yet the person elected according to those laws is by right Divine the successor to St. Peter and supreme head of the Church.

3. Another example. Let us suppose that some prince wishes to found an order of knighthood. He alone will determine what is to be the nature, scope and privileges of this new order, whilst he may leave to a Minister of State the task of arranging what ceremonial shall be employed as essential to the conferring of it. He contents himself with merely giving his Minister some general instructions as to the kind of ceremonial to be employed. And yet there is no one who would deny that under these circumstances the prince is the real and only author of this new degree of rank, ceremonial included.

4. Yet one more example taken from a very practical matter of ecclesiastical procedure: A bishop gives the necessary faculties

---

[1] Vat. Counc. i. Can.

for confessional purposes to one of a religious community of priests, leaving to the Superior the choice of the priest who is to receive these faculties. In other words, whomsoever the Superior shall choose, on that person alone are the faculties conferred; and yet the Superior cannot be said to give the faculties, since such a thing is beyond his power. The bishop alone gives the approbation, for there is question of hearing the confessions of his subjects. After considering these parallel instances we may with justice ask, to quote the words of Father Harent, "Why, then, should Jesus Christ lose the title of institutor of all the sacraments because He had said to his Apostles, to his Church:

"Amongst the sacraments which I am instituting in such number, and for such determined ends, here are some of which I leave you to fix the rite in a more precise manner. I only require that there should be, on the whole, some analogy with the end that I have chosen; and, what is more, I enact that it should contain two parts—something for the eyes, something for the ears (matter and form, as the theologians of the middle ages will afterwards call them). To this rite thus roughly sketched by Me, and more precisely determined by you, I attach this or that supernatural effect." To descend to detail. Let us take the sacrament of Confirmation. We can well imagine Our Blessed Lord saying to His Apostles (we again quote from Father Harent), "I wish to give, to those who have recently become members of the faithful, a grace of strength. I wish to make soldiers of them, to convert them into athletes of the faith; select some rite having, in the first place, an aptitude for conveying this idea. Because of this aptitude which I insist upon, but yet more because of the subsequent choice of this rite by legitimate authority (there is the rite very clearly determined beforehand), I raise it, thus determined, to the rank of a conventional sign of the grace which I promise, and not only to the rank of a sign, but to the rank of an instrument productive of that grace under the action of My Spirit. I alone can attach to such a weak element a like efficacy; I alone can join to it the special presence of My sanctifying Spirit; I alone can put into the sacramental rite that which gives it its value. I alone, in consequence, institute it."

But here we can well imagine an opponent saying, "Your reasoning is very plausible; still you cannot so easily dispose of the Council of Trent. Yet once more it bars the way by a short sentence in the second chapter of its twenty-first session, where it treats of the Church's power over the sacraments. The Church, it says, can change, dispense, etc., in the matter of the sacraments,

'always leaving their essential portion intact' (*salva illorum substantia*). But the matter and form are certainly essential portions of a sacrament. Therefore, according to the Holy Council the Church has absolutely no authority over the matter and form of a sacrament, and your explanation, in consequence, is an impossible one."

In this case, as in the case of the previous difficulty taken from the words of the Council of Trent, there is room for a distinction. Just as we have explained the words "instituted by Christ," so we must explain the words "essential portions" (*substantia*) in the present instance. How are the matter and form essential portions of a sacrament? Only by virtue of a very definite symbolism already determined, and by virtue of a supernatural force, which are only adjoined to the matter and form upon the fulfilment of certain general conditions, which vary according to the nature of the sacrament. Thus, in Confirmation, our Lord would have decided that the material sign should be symbolic of force conferred, of spiritual renewal and strengthening, and that the form of words should correspond to this idea; in Holy Orders the sign should be capable of indicating that spiritual powers, dignity, etc., were conferred, and the form of words likewise should convey the same meaning. It is by the fulfilment of these general conditions, laid down by Christ, that this double rite (matter and form), determined "in specie" by the Church, becomes truly an essential portion of the sacrament, and in so far as these conditions determined by Christ are observed by the Church, so far does the substance of the sacrament remain unchanged.

So much for the general principles. Now let us apply them to a particular sacrament. Holy Orders and Confirmation are the chief sacraments about which there can be question of Christ having determined the rite only "in genere." Let us take the sacrament of Holy Orders and the order of the priesthood, as it is about this order that the controversy principally turns. For the sake of greater clearness it may be well, at the outset, to briefly summarize the main points of the rites used for conferring this order in the Latin and Greek Churches.

The Latin Rite.

1. The bishop, saying nothing, places both his hands on the head of the one to be ordained. The surrounding priests do the same.

2. Immediately afterwards the bishop and the priests hold their hands extended over the one that is to be ordained, whilst the bishop says the following prayer: "Let us, dearest brethren,

beseech God, the Father Almighty, to multiply His heavenly gifts on these His servants, whom He has chosen for the office of the priesthood, and may what they receive through His mercy be ratified by His grace. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

3. He, the bishop, places a stole and chasuble on the one to be ordained, and anoints his hands with the oil of catechumens.

4. He presents him a chalice with wine and water therein, and a paten placed over it with bread, all of which objects the one to be ordained touches. Whilst presenting him with the chalice the bishop says: "Receive power to offer sacrifice and to celebrate masses for the living and the dead. Amen."

5. Then mass is continued, and the newly-ordained, together with the bishop, pronounces the words of consecration.

6. After the communion the bishop places both his hands on the head of the newly ordained, saying: "Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

Greek Rite.

1. The bishop three times signs the head of the one to be ordained with the sign of the cross.

2. Holding his right hand on the head of the one to be ordained, he says: "May the Divine grace, which always has a care of that which is infirm and supplies that which is deficient, promote (N. N.), a venerable deacon, to be a priest. Let us pray for him that the grace of the Holy Ghost may come upon him."

3. He signs him thrice, praying over him.

4. He clothes him in a chasuble.

5. At the time of the Consecration he presents to him a host which has been consecrated, according to some, or a host to be consecrated, according to others.

Between these two rites there is a very substantial difference. In the Greek rite it is beyond question that the ordination is conferred by the first imposition of hands and the accompanying prayer. There is no tradition of instruments, properly so called. In the Latin rite the tradition of instruments plays a very important, and, it would seem, an essential part. And yet the Church recognizes both rites as perfectly valid, with this proviso, that the Greek rite be limited to the Greek Church. The question now to be decided is, what place does the tradition of instruments hold in the Latin rite with regard to the essential part of the sacrament? Is it necessary for the valid conferring of the priesthood in the Latin Church, or is it merely a ceremonial development, which the Church, in the exercise of her powers, has introduced to add

beauty and impressiveness to the ritual and to edify and instruct the faithful? Various answers are given to this question by Catholic theologians. There are some who hold that the first imposition of hands with the accompanying, *i. e.* morally accompanying, form, is the only essential rite, as far as the valid conferring of the sacrament is concerned. Others take an exactly opposite view, and consider the imposition of hands as a mere embellishment of the ritual necessary now for the lawful conferring of the sacrament, but in no way essential. They hold that the only essential rite in the Latin Church is the tradition of instruments and the accompanying forms. Finally (for we shall not consider more than three theological opinions on the point, the three most important ones, and the most generally adopted), there remains a large number of theologians, perhaps the greater number, who teach that, in the Latin Church, both the tradition of instruments and the imposition of hands, at least the first imposition, and the accompanying forms, are necessary not only for the lawful, but also for the valid conferring of the priesthood. If this last doctrine be the true one, and it would seem to be so, then this conclusion follows by a simple process of reasoning that the Church has *de facto* taken a part in determining the essential matter and form of at least one of the sacraments. But is it true that the tradition of instruments is necessary for the valid conferring of the Sacrament of Orders, we always speak of the Latin Church? The arguments usually adduced to prove that it is true, although they do not put the matter absolutely beyond question or dispute, are yet sufficiently strong to make it more than probable, in the opinion of very many theologians, that the tradition of instruments is now an essential portion of the sacramental rite of the priesthood (we have restricted the examination to that particular order). To briefly mention these arguments: we have, in the first place, an authoritative statement of Pope Eugenius IV. in the instructions which he wrote for the Armenians at the time of the Council of Florence.[1] "The sixth sacrament is that of orders, of which the matter is that by the tradition of which the order is conferred: as the order of the priesthood is conferred by the tradition of a chalice with wine and of a paten with bread. . . . The form of the priesthood is thus: Receive the power of offering sacrifice in the church as well for the living as for the dead in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Now, although this document has not the force of an ex cathedra

[1] Denzinger, N. 596.

pronouncement, there can be no doubt about two things. Pope Eugenius IV. evidently considered the tradition of instruments and the accompanying forms an essential portion of the rite, as he expressly says "the order of the priesthood is *conferred*," etc. It is also equally certain that the bull "Exultate Deo," in which this instruction to the Armenians comes, is a document of very great theological importance—so great that some theologians have held it to be a definition of Catholic faith. This is not so, as the words of the bull itself show, since it distinguishes between the several parts, using the word "definition" where there is question of stating matters of faith, and when there is merely question of giving an authoritative instruction using such words as "doctrine," "tradition," "statute," etc. Yet, making full allowance for this, the instruction to the Armenians must be considered at least as an authoritative description of the practice of the Latin Church in the days of the Council of Florence, and that practice, as we see from the words of the Pope, was to treat the tradition of instruments as an essential part of the sacramental rites of the priesthood. It may seem a little extraordinary that Pope Eugenius should make no mention whatever of the imposition of hands. Some have gone so far as to conclude therefrom that the imposition of hands was not an essential part of the rite. But the truth seems to be that the Pope wished principally to draw attention to those points of ritual in which the Latin and Greek Churches differed from each other. Although he makes no explicit mention of the imposition of hands, he does not exclude that rite, and implicitly mentions it by referring the Armenians for whatever he has omitted to the Pontificale Romanum, where the imposition of hands is certainly treated as an essential portion of the sacrament.[1] Besides this argument, drawn from the bull "Exultate Deo," there are many others adduced by those who favor the view that the tradition of instruments is an essential part of the rite. To select a few: St. Thomas, in the supplement to the 3d part of Summa, quaest. 37, art. 5: "Because the principal action of the priest is to consecrate the body and blood of Christ, therefore in the very presenting (to him) of the chalice with the determined form of words, the *sacerdotal character is impressed* (upon him)." Again, Pope Clement VIII., in the instruction which he also wrote for the Greeks, ordains that in the sacrament of penance that form of words shall be used which was prescribed in the general council (of Florence). He thus seems to consider the instruction

[1] *Cf.* Denz. 596.

of Pope Eugenius as an authoritative decree of the General Council, which would considerably increase the force of the argument drawn from that instruction. Again, in the Pontificale Romanum before the tradition of instruments the deacon is called "ordinandus," that is, "the one to be ordained;" after the tradition of the instruments he is called "ordinatus," the one newly ordained. Finally, the practice of the Church, which enacts that the different instruments should be physically touched by the ordinandus, and if, in mistake, they have not been so touched, requires that that portion of the ceremony be repeated.

From all these instances it is more or less clear that the mind of the Church considers this rite of the tradition of instruments as an essential portion of the Sacrament of Orders. I say more or less clear, because, if the proofs alleged do not absolutely put the matter beyond question, they make it extremely probable that it is so. Taking, then, this fact as our major premise, "The tradition of the instruments is an essential portion of the rite in the Latin Church," and, as our minor premise, the tradition of the instruments is of purely ecclesiastical origin and did not exist in the first centuries of the Church's history,[1]—then the only reasonable conclusion is that the Church has claimed the power of changing and determining the rite of a sacrament, and since she has claimed the power she must be considered to possess it. In the words of the celebrated Thomist, Billuart,[2] "Christ did not institute the matter of this sacrament by determining 'in specie' that this or that thing should be the matter of it, but by determining only 'in genere' that it should be conferred by some sensible sign, which should be indicative of the power bestowed; but the determination of this sign in particular, whether it should be this or that thing, whether the imposition of hands or the tradition of instruments or both together, that He left to his Church to decide, as I have already said with reference to the Sacrament of Confirmation. The Church, therefore, using this power given to it by Christ, determined, or at least consented, that the imposition of hands with the corresponding form should in the Greek Church, and perhaps also in former ages in the Latin Church, be the legitimate sign of both powers conferred, namely, of consecrating and of absolving. But afterwards she determined, for the Latin Church, that the tradition of instruments with these words 'Receive power,' etc., should be the legitimate sign of consecrating; the impo-

[1] *Cf.* Gasparri, vol. ii., n. 986.

[2] Bill. de Ordine, dis. ii. art 1, obj. 1.

sition of hands with these words, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' etc., should be the sign of the power of absolving; so that a Greek ordained by the Latin rite, or a Latin ordained by the Greek rite, unless provided with a dispensation from the Supreme Pontiff, would not be validly ordained. That this was the institution and will of Christ we have concluded, together with an almost countless number of theologians, *cum innumeris pene theologis.*" We shall see something more presently about the almost countless number of theologians; but before finally leaving the question of orders it will be well to consider one of the more important difficulties that are urged against the above-mentioned doctrine of Billuart. This consists of the words of Pope Benedict XIV.:[1] "Granted that the Church has the faculty of which we are speaking, namely, of changing the matter of the Sacrament of Order, it is altogether gratuitous and arbitrary to imagine that the Church has ever made use of that privilege. Let them say where and when, in what century, in what Council, by what Pontiff the change was made. For if the Church had taken away from the rite of ordination those things which were customary of old, then we should be compelled to affirm that the matter and form of ordination had been changed by the authority of the Church, and new forms substituted for the old. But when all that are contained in the ancient rituals still persevere unaltered, and are even now holily and exactly observed, no one will easily believe that those same things, which for so long a time were sufficient, now no longer suffice for the valid conferring of this Sacrament of Orders."

It is well to note that Pope Benedict is here only speaking of the Sacrament of Orders, and his words do not extend to the Sacraments of Confirmation and Matrimony, in which it is also held that the Church has exercised her right of determining the matter and form. Again, he does not explicitly deny that the Church has this power; he satisfies himself with merely trying to prove that she has never exercised it. And as for the reason he adduces, as Father Harent remarks, is it quite sure that we can place so much value on this negative kind of argument? Amongst the diriment impediments of matrimony, impediments which render the matrimonial contract null and void, and consequently affect the validity of the sacrament, are there not some for the origin of which it would be extremely difficult to assign any precise date, general council, or known pontifical document?

[1] Benedict XIV. de Synodo, viii., c. x. n. 10.

But in addition to the fact that Pope Benedict's book is by no means to be considered as a pontifical document, the Pope himself in the same work takes care to qualify his statements, thus: "We have wished to expose all this, not for the purpose of passing judgment in favor of this opinion, but only to show that whilst having *against it almost the entire army of the scholastics*, it is not afraid of their blows, and even finds missiles to hurl back at them." Besides, from several quotations which Pope Benedict XIV. makes in this work from the learned Oratorian, Morin, it would seem that he based his view upon a misapprehension of the real teaching of that writer, who in reality held that the Church had and exercised the power of changing the sacramental rite. What Morin endeavors to prove is that the tradition of instruments is of comparatively recent origin.[1] After explicitly stating "Why, then, in effect, shall the Church be unable in the Sacrament of Orders to do that which she has often done in the Sacrament of Matrimony, namely, to fix new conditions for the matter and form, so much so that he who fails to observe these conditions renders the sacrament invalid and null, since Jesus Christ himself did not determine 'in specie' the matter and form of these sacraments. The only thing which we defend is the relatively recent origin of the tradition of instruments, and still more of the last imposition of hands." Finally, before leaving this question of the teaching of Pope Benedict XIV. on the point under consideration, we can oppose to one Papal document another Papal document of equal weight and importance, and teaching a doctrine the contrary of that propounded by Pope Benedict XIV. Pope Innocent IV., in his commentary on the chapter "Presbyter," says: "As for the apostolic rite, we find in the Epistle to Timothy that they placed hands on those who were to be ordained, and that they said prayers over them: but we do not find that they used any other form. Whence we believe that unless forms had been afterwards invented, it would be sufficient for the ordaining prelate to say, 'Be a priest,' or some such equivalent expression; but in subsequent times the Church instituted the forms which are now observed. And these said forms are of so great necessity, that if in an ordination they should have been omitted, then it would be necessary to supply what had been left out."

And now, before we pass to the consideration of the argument of authority, it will serve to strengthen our position if we devote a few words to the opinion put forward by the second class of

[1] Morinus de sac. ordinationibus, p. 3, exerc. 7. c. 6, n 2.

theologians mentioned in the beginning of this article, namely, the opinion of those who teach that Our Lord left some sacraments officially undetermined, and decreed that any matter or form used by a proper minister should be sufficient for the valid conferring of the sacrament, provided only they preserved the general characteristics of the sign instituted by Christ.

Apart from the fact that this view is opposed to the unvarying practice of the Church, which has never left the matter or form to the individual choice of the minister, there is also this *à priori* consideration against it, that of all methods of sacramental institution it would seem to be the most impracticable. And why? Because the sacraments are for the benefit of mankind (*sacramenta propter homines*); and since Our Lord exacts, as an essential condition for their being validly conferred, that a certain matter and form should be used containing a very definite symbolism, it would seem, to say the least, very injudicious on the part of a Divine legislator to leave the essential parts of a sacrament to the caprice of an individual. Besides, the sacrament about which there is greatest question of a rite to be determined is the Sacrament of Orders, on which depend the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, the two most important sacraments after Baptism when there is question of salvation. If, then, there should be any essential defect in the Sacrament of Holy Orders, this defect would of necessity vitiate the other two sacraments, and might in the course of time vitiate the whole or a greater portion of the hierarchy, as far as the validity of their sacerdotal powers was concerned. It is, then, extremely improbable that in a matter of such supreme importance Our Blessed Lord should not have taken every precaution to insure the practical certainty of valid ordination. This He could not do under ordinary circumstances by leaving the rite officially undetermined, whilst exacting that it should be of a certain character and necessary for conferring the sacrament.

But, to return to the opinion advocated in this article, that Christ left the determination of the sacramental rite in the sacraments in question to the authoritative judgment of His Church. Before concluding let us see what is the exact theological value of this opinion. It is the fashion nowadays, in certain theological circles, to treat it as an opinion of little importance, a mere hypothesis that has scarcely any real probability in its favor. Some would go so far as to look upon it with something akin to a suspicion of unorthodoxy. It is well, then, before finally leaving the subject, to see how far the verdict of theological authority is on our side. We have already seen, in the extract from Billuart, that in his day it was the

teaching of a countless number of theologians (*cum innumeris pene theologis*); we have seen that Pope Benedict XIV. acknowledged it to be the view received by almost the entire army of scholastics. Gasparri, also of the opposite camp, describes those who hold it as not a few eminent theologians, and Father Harent, in his article in "Les Études," has taken the trouble to gather together the names of some of these eminent theologians. They are not restricted to one century or to one school of theological thought. Every school is represented—the early scholastics, the doctors of the Council of Trent, the Thomists, the Carmelites of Salamanca, the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne, the Scotists, the Society of Jesus. Finally, this opinion is held by many celebrated canonists and moralists, and in our own day it does not lack distinguished adherents, amongst whom we beg leave to mention the Reverend Father Harent himself, and also the Reverend Father Louis Billot, S. J., Professor of Dogma at the Roman College. It is evident, then, that those who hold this opinion with such excellent company cannot in the slightest degree incur the note of temerity. On the contrary, when they remember the words of Billuart already quoted, they may without any very great stretch of imagination be tempted to apply to this doctrine the words of St. Augustine, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*"

F. Rankin, S. J.

## CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE "DARK AGES."

(A.D. 476—A.D. 1100.)

THE fifth century closed in darkness, and as we look at the situation of affairs which immediately followed, not with the jaundiced eye of a prejudiced critic, but with the candid fair-mindedness of one in search of the truth, the wonder is, not that the times were dark but that there was any light at all.

Historians of the school of Hallam, and especially Robertson, whom the Protestant Maitland characterizes as "a very miserable, second-hand writer," find it to their interest somehow to besmirch the memory of the monks of old, while they heap mountains of calumny and gross misrepresentations upon a system of religious institutions of whose supernatural nature and purport they understood absolutely nothing. Their broad and unsubstantiated assertions, sad to say, are allowed by many to pass unchallenged. While the continent of Europe was swarming with barbarians and weltering in blood; while its towns and cities with their amassed treasures were given over to pillage and fire; when all seemed lost, the monasteries became the sole repositories of learning, and continued so for many a long, long day. This is the incontestable fact as it confronts us upon the page of history, and the most ingenious combinations of talent and bigotry have never been able to disprove it.

We have seen how from the very outset monasteries became educational centres. We may form some idea of the intellectual atmosphere which they developed if we bear in mind that, with few exceptions, the early fathers and doctors of the Church had been monks or were educated in monasteries—Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Augustine, Fulgentius, Sulpicius Severus, Vincent of Lerins, Cassian, Salvian, and much later, Gregory the Great—not to speak of others, the bare mention of whose names is guarantee sufficient of the educational value of the ancient monastic training. It was the profound learning of these mighty ones of the elder time, as embalmed in their imperishable works, which for centuries presided over the development of Christian doctrine and formed the groundwork of Scholasticism in a subsequent age. The immortal "Summa" of the Angelical Doctor did but codify and systematize truths upon

which these primitive writers, pupils of the monasteries, had rung the magnificent changes ages before. At the end of the fifth century the West, like the East, had become fruitful in these nurseries of learning, and when the municipal schools disappeared with the fall of the Empire, children were driven to have recourse to them for whatever learning was saved from the universal wreck.

There was one flaw, however, in the monastic system as it then existed, and that was a lack of proper organization, in default of which satisfactory and permanent educational results were less readily attainable. This evil was remedied by the great patriarch of the West, Saint Benedict, who, A.D. 529, at Monte Cassino laid the foundations of an order destined to absorb or supplant all previous monastic institutions in the West and keep alive in its cloisters the torch of learning amid the worse than Cimmerian darkness deepening around. That it filled a pressing need is obvious from the rapidity with which it spread. Before the end of the century in which it was born Benedictines were in every country laboring and praying and teaching, and by the disinterested holiness of their lives pointing the way to an elevation of character and a need of civilization of which the barbarian had never heard or dreamt.

The time of the monks was devoted to the inculcation of a knowledge which to us seems scant enough, though it was considerable then. It was mainly ecclesiastical in character. The fact is quite intelligible when we remember that the principal object of education in an age so barbarous was not so much cultivation as civilization—finish as foundation. What youth needed most was to outgrow its savage environments, and to this secular education was far less conducive than familiarity with the truths of Holy Writ and the fruitful suggestiveness of the Church's liturgy. Besides, the primary object of the monastic schools was to train aspirants to the religious or priestly state, and it was only as a matter of necessity that they were thrown open for the patronage of students intended for mere secular avocations. Many were put in the monasteries when very young; some even in their infancy.[1] This was rendered more or less urgent by the prevailing

[1] "The custom," says Doctor Lingard, "of offering children to be devoted for life to the monastic or clerical profession, was early adopted in the Christian Church, in imitation of the oblation of the prophet Samuel in the temple of Jerusalem. The idea that the determination of his parents was no less binding on the child than the voluntary profession of adults was first embraced in the sixth century, and followed until the pontificate of Celestine III., who, according to the more ancient discipline, permitted the child at a certain age to decide for himself."—*Hist. and Antiq. of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 231, note 6.

"The fierce northern warriors," says Cardinal Newman, "who had won for them-

disorders, and found abundant sanction, secular and ecclesiastical, in the admitted customs of the times. Thus, for instance, Saint Boniface, the great apostle of Germany, became a monk when only five years old.[1] Venerable Bede, as he tells us himself, en-

selves the lands of Christendom with their red hands, rejoiced to commit their innocent offspring to the custody of religion and of peace. Nay, sometimes with the despotic will of which I have just now spoken, they dedicated them, from or before their birth, to the service of Heaven. They determined that some at least of their lawless race should be rescued from the contamination of blood and license, and should be set apart in sacred places to pray for their kindred. The little beings, of three or four or five years old, were brought in the arms of those who gave them life to accept at their bidding the course in which that life was to run. They were brought into the sanctuary, spoke by the mouth of their parents, as at the font, put out their tiny hand for the sacred corporal to be wrapped round it, received the cowl and took their place as monks in the monastic community. In the first ages of the Benedictine Order, these children were placed on a level with their oldest brethren. They took precedence according to the date of their admission, and the grey head gave way to them in choir and refectory, if junior to them in monastic standing. They even voted in the election of Abbot, being considered to speak by divine instinct, as the child who cried out 'Ambrose is Bishop.' If they showed waywardness in community meetings, inattention at choir, ill-behavior at table, which certainly was not an impossible occurrence, they were corrected by the nods, the words, or the blows of the grave brother who happened to be next them; it was not till an after time that they had a prefect of their own, except in school hours. That harm came from this remarkable discipline is only the suggestion of our modern habits and ideas; that it was not expedient for all times, follows from the fact that at a certain date it ceased to be permitted. However, that in those centuries in which it was in force, its result was good, is seen in the history of the heroic men whom it nurtured, and might have been anticipated from the principle which it embodied."—*Historical Sketches*, vol. ii., art. "The Benedictine Schools."

[1] Which rather conflicts with Mr. Emerton's amusing statement that Boniface, for a time, carried on his mission in Germany on his own account, but finding that it would help his enterprise immensely, eventually allied himself with the Church of Rome. He says: "The famous Englishman Boniface, the Apostle to the Germans, had come over from England and entered upon the work of a missionary among the Frisians along the shores of the North Sea. From there he had gone over into the valleys of the Main and Danube, and had had remarkable success in founding churches and monasteries, which were to be so many centres of light in these still barbarous regions. For a time he had carried on this work on his own account, but soon he saw that if he could make himself the agent of Rome he would strengthen his cause very greatly. The papacy was the more ready to adopt him as its own, because there were already missionaries at work in these same parts who had taught a form of Christianity different in many ways from that of Rome. These missionaries had come from that Keltic church which we saw established in the west of England and in parts of Scotland and Ireland at the time when Augustine had carried the Roman form to the Anglo-Saxons, and the conflict between them and Boniface was the same which went on there between Augustine and the ancient British church. The question in both cases was the same: Should Rome become the one centre of church life in the West, or should the life of the church, like that of the state, gather about several centres? Should there be national churches, or but one all-embracing Church Catholic of which Rome should be the single and supreme head? In great parts of Germany, as in Great Britain, it had seemed as if a local, national church might grow up quite independent of Rome; but after the work of Boniface it was clear that the hold of Rome upon Germany was fixed forever."—(*An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages* (375–814), by Ephraim Emerton, Ph.D., Professor of History in Harvard University. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1888, p. 131.)

tered the monastery of Wearmouth at seven; while Saint Bruno, as late as the tenth century, was committed to the monks at Utrecht at the advanced age of four years. About the age of seven, children began the work of education proper by learning the Psalter. It was of obligation for all monks and ecclesiastics to know it, and accordingly it was the first thing taken up. When they had mastered it they entered upon their course of profane study, which consisted, presupposing the acquisition of reading and writing, of the three fundamentals: grammar, rhetoric and logic, which constituted what was called the *Trivium;* and the four mathematical and more advanced sciences of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy, which were known as the *Quadrivium.* The two together embraced what was called "The Seven Liberal Arts." By "grammar" was understood something more than etymology, syntax and prosody. It included rhetoric and, in a measure, the study of literature. "Rhetoric" in turn was rather declamation and public speaking. By "music" was understood the science as far as acquaintance with it then extended, which, we may suppose, was considerable in some cases when we bear in mind that Gregorian chant takes its name from a monk of the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great, whose famous school of chant was for a long time prominent and became the model of many others subsequently founded in Germany and France by Saint Boniface and Charlemagne.[1] The language spoken in the class-room was Latin, and children were required to master it even before the vernacular. The literature studied was mainly Roman. In fact, the whole monastic educational system bore a striking resemblance to that of the ancient municipal schools of the Empire, already described. "The curriculum," says Cardinal Newman, "derived from the earlier ages of heathen philosophy, was transferred to the use of the Church on the authority of Saint Augustine, who in his *De Ordine* considers it to be the fitting and sufficient preparation for theological learning. It is hardly necessary to refer to the history of its formation; we are told how Pythagoras prescribed the study of arithmetic, music

[1] "After the manner of a wise Solomon," says an ancient writer speaking of Gregory, "being touched by the sweetness of music he carefully compiled his *Centon*, or Antiphonary of chants, and established a school of those chants which had hitherto been sung in the Roman Church, and built for this purpose two houses, one attached to the church of Saint Peter the Apostle, and the other near the Lateran Patriarchium, where, up to this day, are preserved with becoming veneration the couch whereon he was accustomed to rest when singing; and the rod wherewith he was accustomed to threaten the boys, together with the authentic copy of his Antiphonary."—*Christian Schools and Scholars*, Drane, p. 60.

and geometry; how Plato and Aristotle insisted on grammar and music, which, with gymnastics, were the substance of Greek education; how Seneca speaks, though not as approving, of grammar, music, geometry and astronomy as the matter of education in his own day; and how Philo, in addition to these, has named logic and rhetoric. Saint Augustine in his enumeration of them begins with arithmetic and grammar, including under the latter history; then he speaks of logic and rhetoric; then of music, under which comes poetry as equally addressing the ear; lastly of geometry and astronomy, as addressing the eye. The Alexandrians, whom he followed, arranged them differently, viz., grammar, rhetoric and logic or philosophy, which branched off into the four mathematical sciences of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy.

Greek was studied very little and an acquaintance with its literature was individual and exceptional. Hence it does not figure extensively in the class-room until quite late. It was indeed a rare accomplishment, and with the vast majority served no higher purpose than an elegant affectation. Bede, Alcuin, Paschasius and others, we are told, were familiar with it, and it is no more than likely that they taught it to some of their pupils, without, however, giving it in the school-room the prominence enjoyed by Latin. In a few of the monasteries, notably that of Saint Gall, it was studied and taught, and from a very early date. With time it came into more general use and played a conspicuous part in later monastic curricula. This impulse given to its pursuit was due to Charlemagne, who set the seal of his royal approbation, so to speak, upon it and made its cultivation the fashion by having it taught in the college of Osnaberg, established by him, and which attained some renown, but whose history is lost in the darkness and confusion which envelop the period. It is noteworthy that some of the most proficient Greek scholars of mediæval times were women. In fact, having the same and in many cases better facilities for mental improvement than the men, and having more time on their hands and nothing but serious books within reach, it is not surprising that the ladies of those days, whether nuns in convents or dames at court, did much to foster the thorough cultivation of the classics—Hebrew, Latin and Greek. Very many of them wrote Latin and a few Greek verse with finish and ease. Saint Radegundes, a nun of the sixth century, found leisure for the study of the Latin and Greek patristic commentaries. Among the friends of Saint Boniface was a community of English nuns remarkable for their classical attainments,

many of whom at his request followed him into Germany and there opened schools for girls. Foremost among them was Saint Lioba, who, it is narrated, was thoroughly versed in the Scriptures, the writings of the Greek and Latin fathers, and the canons of the Church. The nuns in the convent of the famous but unfortunate Heloise studied Greek as well as Latin, Hebrew and Arabic; while of another we are told that she familiarized herself not only with the Greek and Latin classics, but also with the philosophical works of Aristotle.

Physical science, as might be expected, was far less developed in the monastic schools than the study of language. Many of the monks lectured and wrote upon such subjects, some of them voluminously, but their views in most cases, if not groundless surmises, were at least broader than their premises, and in the light of subsequent investigation and discovery have proven the merest puerilities. But for all that it is to their credit that despite the odds against them they fostered a spirit of scientific inquiry at all; and while, on the one hand, it does not add much to our stock of information to be told, for instance, as Rabanus Maurus, one of the mediæval lights, tells us, that the mouse and house-fly came originally from Greece, and that birds are divided into big birds and little birds, in which latter class he puts the wasp and the locust, yet, on the other, it is a subject of wonder to see what acquaintance Bede, and centuries later Albertus Magnus, had with matters whose discovery we are accustomed to look upon as of comparatively recent date. We can afford to marvel when the great naturalist Von Humboldt could not refrain from expressing his surprise. "Albertus Magnus," he says, "was equally active and influential in promoting the study of natural science and of the Aristotelian philosophy. . . . . His works contain some exceedingly acute remarks on the organic structure and physiology of plants. One of his works, bearing the title of 'Liber Cosmographicus de Natura Locorum,' is a species of physical geography. I have found in it considerations on the dependence of temperature concurrently on latitude and elevation, and on the effect of different angles of incidence of the sun's rays in heating the ground, which have excited my surprise."[1]

As text-books were rare, a great deal of dictation was necessary. The weariness which it begot soon led to the invention of shorthand methods of reporting discourse. Some monasteries became famous for their shorthand classes, and their professors

[1] *Cosmos*, vol. ii., p. 243 *in fine*. Translation by E. C. Otté.

celebrated not only for their own but for their scholars' proficiency. Of the text-books in use, the most renowned were the "Grammatical Institutions" of Priscian, in eighteen books, of which, so the story goes, Theodosius the younger was so enamored that he copied them with his own hand; the "Distichia Moralia," a popular class-book whose composition was attributed to Cato, but is more commonly believed to have been the work of a monk of the second century;[1] the grammar of Donatus, the teacher of Saint Jerome, which continued a favorite throughout the middle ages; various works of Boëtius, a writer of the fifth century and one of the last and brightest scholars of the decline. He wrote original Latin productions for class use, and it was to his translations from the Greek that medieval students owed much of their acquaintance, which was none too extensive, with the writers of Hellas. To these let us add "On the Teaching of Sacred Letters" and "The Seven Liberal Arts," written by Cassiodorus for the school which he founded at Viviers, and which were also works in long and favorable repute. The best known and no doubt the most generally used was the "Satyricon" of Martianus Capella, written about the year 470. It was an encyclopædia in nine books, covering in its treatment the matter embraced in the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. In contained whatever knowledge was then extant upon the so-called "Seven Liberal Arts," and such was its widespread popularity that it continued in favor as the text-book by excellence for upwards of a thousand years and was translated into various languages and adopted everywhere. Possibly the one who did most in the composition of text-books, and that at a time which Mr. Hallam stigmatizes as the nadir of European civilization, was Saint Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, and one of the founders of the celebrated seminary to which allusion has already been made in a previous paper. He died in the year 630. Isidore was certainly a learned man, and was looked upon as an intellectual prodigy by his contemporaries. The work which won him his great reputation is entitled "Origines; seu Etymologiarum Libri." It is in twenty books, and not only embraces the *Trivium* and the *Quadrivium*, but also the subjects God, man, the world, Scripture, medicine, law, language, geography, agriculture, zoology, and a number of other miscellaneous topics. Of these productions, and similar ones of lesser note, Hallam remarks that their very meagreness is proof sufficient of an almost total literary decay. True. No one attempts to deny

[1] On this work, *cf. Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*, Healy, p. 117.

their superficiality of treatment. On the other hand, they are not to be tried by the canons of nineteenth century criticism, which it would be well for Hallam, Milman, Robertson, Brucker, and our own Mr. Emerton always to bear in mind.

The claustral and cathedral schools, in default of many of our modern improvements, were conducted under difficulties not hard to conceive. The monastic school for externs was in a building apart from the cloister. There was a head master and an assistant. In the larger monastic institutions the corps of professors, as we would now phrase it, was quite numerous. The system was paternal, though the rod figured conspicuously in the moral training of the mediæval "small boy," but hardly to the absurd extent asserted by Laurie, who says that "in many monasteries all the boys were periodically flogged as a kind of general atonement for sins past and possible;" this, too, on the ridiculous assumption that the devil was in the heart of every boy, and could only be gotten out by trouncing. The students, especially the younger ones, were carefully looked after by the monks appointed to act as prefects, and whose duty it was to remain with their charges night and day—exercising the closest supervision over their conduct. Education was absolutely free, and in many instances, as at Yarrow in the time of Venerable Bede, indigent pupils were even provided with food and clothing at the expense of the cloister. The boys continued at school until fourteen years of age, when they departed to enter their respective fields of labor. If they desired to be monks, they remained in the monastery undergoing the discipline suited to that kind of life. Facilities for the pursuit of higher studies were not to be had until the time of Charlemagne, A.D. 768, who, in imitation of the imperial system of old Rome, whose educational as well as governmental polity he sought in many respects to reproduce, founded advanced schools in various parts of his extensive dominion. The most celebrated were at Paris, Tours, Pavia, Rheims, Lyons, Fulda and Bologna. Some see in them the germs of the mediæval universities, whose origin scholars find it difficult to trace with accuracy. Such were the teachers. Such was the learning afforded by the early mediæval monastic schools. It may be taken as a fair estimate of the educational advantages offered by the monasteries in general. We say "in general," for some were, of course, more advanced than others. But our concern is not with the exception, but with the rule. That education under these circumstances, and in spite of the obstacles in the way of its development, did not remain at a standstill, is sufficiently manifest by the progress made in certain

monasteries when the circumstances of the times, especially the royal patronage and the discontinuance of wars, were conducive to its rapid and healthy growth. Indeed it is impossible not to observe, though the transition be at times ever so gradual and well nigh invisible, as we thread our way through the twilight from the sixth to the twelfth century, a progressive movement towards the broader educational condition of things in which it finally culminated. Where the monks of the fifth and sixth centuries were occupied with saving the remnants of ancient literature, purging and adapting authors for class purposes, and imparting the merest elements to the as yet untutored barbarian, their successors in the eighth and ninth and eleventh had strung their instruments for songs in a higher key. The monk Gerbert, raised subsequently to the Papal chair under the title of Sylvester II., was holding forth upon the *Categories* and *Topics* of Aristotle. The professors in certain German monasteries were delivering lectures in Greek, Hebrew and Arabic. At Dijon the monks of Saint Benignus were discoursing on medicine, while the enterprising inmates of Saint Gall were teaching painting, engraving, and, in the opinion of some, sculpture.[1] This development would have been more systematic and pronounced from the start if the zeal of the monks, unhampered by endless political and social unrest, had been the only factor in the circulation. It was not, however, and those pious men who found so much time for the conduct of schools still felt that the bulk of their energies had to be devoted to the spiritual rather than the intellectual benefit of their neighbors. How well they succeeded in their missionary undertakings is shown by the fact that within the compass of six centuries they had reclaimed from Arianism the Goths and Vandals, and "instructed in the Gospel the idolatrous nations of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary, Saxony, Poland and Russia."

Such was the monk at home: such his work. But if we would gauge him aright and allot him his due meed of praise we must follow him abroad and study his endeavors for the widespread diffusion of knowledge. The fifth century, as we have said,

[1] "Rabanus Maurus was about the first to comment on the *Introduction* of Porphyry, and on portions of the *Organon*. In the year 935, whilst Reinard of S. Burchard, in Wurtemburg, commented on Aristotle's *Categories*, Poppo was elucidating, at Fulda, the *Commentary* of Bœthius. Notker Labeo, who died in 1022, translated into German the *Commentary* of Bœthius, and the *Categories* and *Interpretation* of the Stagyrite. Abbo of Fleury (1004) wrote a clever and original work on the *Conclusions*, and Adalberon, Bishop of Laon (1030), disciple of Gerbert, wrote a dissertation *De Modo recte Argumentandi et Prædicandi Dialecticam*.—Saint Thomas of Aquin, Vaughn, p. 188.

closed in darkness. The schools of the Empire and the earliest attempts at Christian education were at first brought to naught by the deluge of barbarism which swept over the continent of Europe, though destined, after years of almost utter obliteration, to revive and become the foundation of modern civilization, reform and culture. In the meanwhile, that is to say in the sixth and seventh centuries, by a providential arrangement, peace reigned in what are now the British Isles. Thither learning fled. In England and Ireland, during the three centuries following the fall of the Roman empire, monasteries were multiplied, and education diligently fostered, and scholars nurtured who went forth when the storm abated and set about the process of reconstruction all through Europe. During the sixth and seventh centuries, says Doctor Döllinger, the schools in the Irish cloisters were "the most celebrated in all the west." Famous among them were those of Armagh, which at one time could boast of seven thousand pupils; Lismore; Cashel; Kildare; Aran "of the saints;" Clonard, where the great Columba studied; Clonmacnoise; Benchor, and Clonfert, founded by Saint Brendan.[1] The arrival of Saint Augustine in England with a colony of monks from Monte Cassino, A.D. 597, inaugurated for the seventh and eighth centuries a most prosperous educational era in that island. Canterbury, Lindisfarne, Malmsbury, Croyland, Yarrow, Wearmouth, York, Oxford and various other centres, are at once suggestive to the student of history of the active spirit which had taken possession of the country. To the schools of these isles, and that for upwards of three hundred years, students, regardless of the difficulties of the journey, flocked in thousands and from all quarters, even from Greece and Egypt. Of the great men who studied within their enclosure, and who afterwards became the pioneers of the revived learning and civilization throughout the western world, it will suffice to mention Saint Columba, the Apostle of Caledonia; Saint Columbanus, who evangelized France, Burgundy, Switzerland and Lombardy; Saint Columbkille; Saint Boniface, the Apostle of Ger-

[1] "During the sixth and seventh centuries the church of Ireland stood in the full beauty of its bloom. . . . The schools in the Irish cloisters were at that time the most celebrated in all the West; and in addition to those which have been already mentioned, there flourished the schools of Saint Finian of Clonard, founded in 530, and those of Saint Cataldus, founded in 640. Whilst almost the whole of Europe was desolated by war, peaceful Ireland, free from the invasions of external foes, opened to the lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum. The strangers who visited Ireland not only from the neighboring shores of Britain, but also from the most remote nations of the continent, received from the Irish people the most hospitable reception, a gratuitous entertainment, free instruction, and even the books that were necessary for their studies."—*History of the Church*, Döllinger, Vol. II., p. 31.

many; Saint Gall, the Apostle of Switzerland; Saint Fridolin; Saint Sigisbert; Saint Killian; Saint Virgilius; Saint Cataldus; Saint Kentigern; Saint Willibrod; Saint Donatus; Saint Frigdian; Venerable Bede; Aldhelm; Alcuin, and an army of others. Under their influence the barbarian, grown weary of strife and realizing the desolation which he had wrought, was gradually moulded to better things. He became as eager to learn as they were to teach, and their work went on prosperously if slowly. "As the Irish missionaries," to quote Newman again, "travelled down through England, France and Switzerland to lower Italy and attempted Germany at the peril of their lives, founding churches, schools and monasteries as they went along, so, amid the deep pagan woods of Germany and round about, the English Benedictine plied his axe and drove his plough, planted his rude dwelling and raised his rustic altar upon the ruins of idolatry, and then, settling down as a colonist upon the soil, began to sing his chants and to copy his old volumes, and thus to lay the slow but sure foundation of the new civilization."[1]

The first of the three most notable movements in the direction of educational progress occurred during the reign of Charles the Great, which extended from A.D. 768 to A.D. 814. This illustrious man—"the King of Europe" and "the Orthodox Emperor," as he was fondly styled on account of the vast extent of territory over which he ruled and his noble defense of religion, though himself a stranger to literary cultivation, could nevertheless appreciate the accomplishment in others. A journey through Italy about the year 780 brought him in contact with certain scholars of whose learning he was in admiration. The event determined him to do all in his power to raise the intellectual standard of his subjects by putting within their reach every facility for educational improvement. It was a sadly needed reform, the internecine wars of the Merovingians having done much to cripple learning and paralyze the popular zeal for its acquisition. It was the dream of Charlemagne's lifetime to lay the foundation of an empire destined to rival in splendor the glories of ancient Rome, and he felt that this were impossible without the revival of letters on a scale approaching, if not surpassing, the traditional renown of the Augustan Age. He had heard of the system of higher and secondary education as it had prevailed in the universities of old at Rome, Athens, Constantinople, Alexandria and elsewhere. He had seen it in active though imperfect operation in the Benedictine monasteries, in

[1] *Loc. cit.*

which a partial line of demarcation between the higher and lower studies was drawn. Accordingly, his first care was to send earnest instructions to the bishops and abbots and priests urging them to enter heartily into his scheme of educational reform by exerting themselves vigorously for the benefit of their cathedral and monastic as also of their parochial schools. All this in order to qualify youth the more effectively for entrance into the Palatine or Palace School established at the Court, or similar institutions soon to be modeled upon it in other parts of the kingdom. The text of this capitular or encyclical letter, "the first general charter of education for the middle ages," is quoted in full by Mr. Mullinger in his popular and well-known work upon the schools of Charlemagne as affording a marked evidence of the educational status of the times. "We exhort you, therefore," says the emperor, "not only not to neglect the study of letters, but to apply yourself thereto with perseverance and with that humility which is well pleasing to God. . . . Let there therefore be chosen for this work men who are both able and willing to learn and also desirous of instructing others; and let them apply themselves to the work with a zeal equalling the earnestness with which we recommend it to them."[1] The emperor's next care was to secure the best professors, and for these he looked to England and Ireland. The most celebrated of those whose services he engaged was Alcuin, an English monk of the monastery of York. He enjoyed widespread fame as a teacher and a scholar, and so impressed Charles, whom he met at Parma on the occasion of the visit already alluded to, that he prevailed upon him to resign his position as head master of the schools in his monastery and take up his residence in Frankland, there to become the corner-stone of the new order of things about to be inaugurated.[2] The learning which Alcuin brought with him was signalized and recommended by the tradition which had come down to him through a series of distinguished saints and scholars direct from the See of Peter.[3] He continued with very little interruption for fourteen years, from A.D. 782 to A.D. 796, co-operating with his royal master for the furtherance of his educational plans. He then severed his connection with the

[1] *The Schools of Charles the Great*, J. Bass Mullinger, M.A., pp. 97–99; *Schools of Charlemagne*, Newman, *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 151; *Hist. Sket.*, Vol. III.

[2] According to some writers. Laurie says they met at Padua; Newman, at Pavia.

[3] We refer particularly to the celebrated Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose achievements have been rightly said to constitute an era in the history of the English Church. For an account of his zeal in behalf of schools and letters, *vide Conversion of the Teutonic Race*, Hope, c. xi.; Newman, *loc. cit.*, 451; *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Lingard, c. 11.

Palace School, retired from court, and sought a quiet retreat in the monastery of Saint Martin, at Tours, the incursions of the Norsemen, which had begun in the meantime, rendering it impossible for him to return to his much-loved island home.

Among the distinguished successors to Alcuin in the Palace School should be mentioned Rabanus Maurus, also Dungal and Clement, two Irish scholars of rare ability, whose proffered services in the cause of education Charlemagne readily accepted and rewarded. At a later date, during the reign of Charles the Bald, and after the school had been transferred from Aix-la-Chapelle to Paris, we find at the head of it the famous Scotus Erigena, with whom theologians are sufficiently familiar. Scotus was an eminent Oriental linguist, had studied in Ireland and travelled much in the East, where, no doubt, the metaphysical speculations for which he became so celebrated had become tinged with the Platonism of the Alexandrian schools. His heretical views touching the Eucharist and free will soon led to no end of conflict and controversy, until his public condemnation by the Church became an imperative necessity. The Palace School and such as were more or less fashioned upon it were intended to furnish every facility for the prosecution of higher studies, and therefore designed to complete the work begun in the primary or parochial schools, and carried on through the minor cathedral and monastery schools. A youth graduating from one of these latter passed to one or other of the former or major schools which, by royal decree issued A. D. 789, had been erected in connection with certain of the larger monasteries, as, for instance, with those of Saint Gall, Fulda, Fleury, Fontanelles, and at least a dozen more referred to by Mabillon. In the primary or village parochial school reading, writing, arithmetic and singing were all that was taught. In the minor schools the work previously begun was continued and augmented by the addition of the *Trivium.* In the major schools the *Quadrivium* was added, and such special languages and sciences as individual institutions were able to supply, which, in some cases, was considerable. Over the primary or parochial school the parish priest presided. Over the monastery school, minor and major, whether conducted for interns or externs, the abbot. Over the cathedral school, the bishop, directly, or indirectly by means of the *Scholasticus*, or head master appointed by him. Instruction was gratuitous. The schools were strictly public; equally open to rich and poor. The whole system was capped by the Palace School. From it all others naturally took their cue, as it was generally, though not

always, controlled by the best teachers, and consequently was easily able to set the fashion and give the tone to the rest of the country in matters literary and scientific. It is worthy of observation that the Palace School was for girls as well as boys; women as well as men. It was to one of his female pupils that Alcuin dedicated his commentaries upon the Gospel of Saint John and his treatise on the nature of the human soul. It goes without saying that throughout the moral training of the pupils was most sedulously looked to. Catechism, Scripture, ecclesiastical chant and the Church's calendar and ceremonies were carefully taught. It certainly must have been a great stimulus to the diligence of scholars everywhere to note the zest with which the Emperor "went to school," taking his place upon the forms in the class-room and asking and answering questions like the youngest pupil, whilst the eloquence of Alcuin opened up to his untutored mind the profundities of grammar and arithmetic or of astronomy, of which he seems to have been particularly fond. We may thus conceive of the Palace School as a sort of university centre, though in no sense a university; nor, in the opinion of Cardinal Newman, even the nucleus of the subsequent mediæval universities, as Du Boulay, in his eagerness to trace the origin of that of Paris to Charlemagne, so stoutly contends. Some idea of the broad gauge upon which the Emperor proposed to operate his plan of educational reform may be gathered from the fact that even the Palace School was not intended exclusively for members of the court, but admitted also those of humble origin whose exceptional talent gave promise of future ability.

When in this connection we speak of "higher studies," we use the term relatively, of course. There was, for instance, in astronomy as taught by Alcuin much that was never dreamt of in Herschel's philosophy or seen through the Lick telescope. But all the same, what there was of endeavor merits praise instead of ridicule, as it pointed distinctly to a forward and not to a retrogressive movement. It may be said that the great Emperor brought the full force not only of his example but also of his authority to bear upon the promotion of education throughout his dominions. As he had commanded, and that in various capitulars, all bishops, abbots and priests to second his efforts to provide the necessary learning for his subjects, so in like manner he commanded the subjects in their turn to profit to the full by the opportunities afforded. Every inducement in the shape of rewards and preferments was offered, and when these failed compulsion was had recourse to. In a capitular issued A. D. 812 he

ordained that "every one should send his son to study letters, and that the child should remain at school with all diligence until he should become well instructed in learning." The result of so much activity on the part of Charlemagne and such prompt co-operation on the part of the monks was a general revival of learning within his dominions. Their influence was still more widespread. Wherever the fame of his literary achievements extended; wherever the pupils of the Frankish schools travelled, there the spirit of inquiry was awakened and an eager desire to imitate, if not to emulate them, was enkindled. That his scheme of reform, left to itself, would have produced permanent and happy results there is no questioning. His immediate successors, Louis le Debonnaire and Charles the Bald, did their utmost to bring it to maturity. But political dissensions, whose origin and course it were beyond our present purpose to trace, begot civil discord, and in the social upheavals of protracted war the educational work of Charlemagne was undone. The growth of feudalism and the dismemberment of the Carlovingian Empire, which was in progress for a century and a half—that is to say from the middle of the ninth to the end of the tenth century—played havoc with the schools. Yet it were false to say that the interest and industry put out by so many minds and through so long a time upon the advancement of learning were productive of no results. There is a conservation of moral as of physical energy in the world, and the prolific idea, once set in motion, never dies until it has brought forth to fullness, somewhere and somehow, the fruitage of which its pent-up vitality gave hopeful assurance. The efforts of Charlemagne, if not altogether successful, were certainly not entirely abortive. The cathedral and conventual schools had been actively revived.[1] A new impulse had been given to the study of the German language.[2] Pupils graduated

[1] The Episcopal or Cathedral schools which had almost, if not entirely, disappeared during the dreadful period of the barbaric invasions, had been gradually re-established whenever and wherever an altered condition of affairs allowed. Under the Merovingians, according to Ozanam, at least twenty could be enumerated in France alone. Charlemagne gave a new impulse to their revival and multiplication. It was in the assembly of Aix-la-Chapelle and in the year 789 that bishops received their first command to open, in connection with their cathedrals, schools that were both public and free. Alluding to their general character at this time, West says: "The Episcopal or Cathedral schools were neither so strict nor so flourishing as the monastic schools, whose exterior side they resembled, educating candidates for the priesthood and children of laymen generally. . . . . Apart from the rigorous discipline of monastic life exacted from the *oblati*, there is, however, no essential distinction to be drawn between the instruction furnished in the monasteries and cathedrals."—*Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*, p. 57.

[2] *Cf. Saint Boniface and the Conversion of Germany*, Hope, c. 25.

from his schools had scattered themselves over Europe, disseminating elsewhere the seed which could no longer grow in soil now become uncongenial. While the entire life of the great man, in so far as he is connected with the history of education, has built up a tradition whose splendor still hangs, like a sunset glory, upon the distant and darkening horizon of those far-off times, and still works like a charm upon the minds of scholars. None the less, it is true that at this juncture, the beginning of the tenth century, the continent was lapsing into darkness. Education and learning once again fled to Britain, where peace was beginning to reign, and there sought to build themselves a habitation amid the ruined and deserted cloisters where the monks of other days had lived and prayed and studied and taught.

When Alfred the Great, A. D. 872, succeeded to the throne of Britain the aspect of affairs was dismal in the extreme. The ravages of the Danes had exiled studies from the kingdom and left but little trace of the educational labors of the early monks and missionaries. The churches and monasteries, the only homes of learning, had been pillaged. Their inmates, its only guardians, had been murdered. Lindisfarne, Coldingham, Tynemouth, Bardney, Croyland, Medeshamstede and Ely amongst the number, were in ashes. "At this period," says Doctor Lingard, speaking of the close of the Danish invasion, "the English church offered to the friends of religion a melancholy and alarming spectacle. The laity had resumed the ferocity of their heathen forefathers; the clergy were dissolute and illiterate; and the monastic order was in a manner annihilated.[1] Like Charlemagne, Alfred felt that his mission was to be one of reconstruction. Accordingly he set to work to rebuild monasteries, to gather together teachers, open schools, and urge his subjects, by example no less than by precept, to do all in their power for the furtherance of knowledge. Returning from Rome, a visit to the court of Charles the Bald had thrown him in contact with scholarly men and introduced him to the workings of the Palace School, which he made it his purpose to reproduce in his own dominions as soon as a lull in the storm of battle would permit.

During the fifteen years of peace which the country enjoyed immediately after the decisive encounter of Ethandune (A.D. 873), Alfred set vigorously to work. He gave himself to diligent study, securing as teacher and head of the Palace School, Asser, a monk

---

[1] *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. 11; *The Life of King Alfred the Great*, Knight; *Annales Rerum Gestarum Aelfredi Magni*, Asser.

of St. David's, or Menevia, in Wales, who subsequently became his biographer. Asser enjoyed a widespread reputation for learning and ability. It was only, however, after considerable delay and difficulty that the King prevailed upon him to spend six out of the twelve months each year in England, superintending the Palatine and such other schools as were placed under his direction. For it is surmised, and with good reason, that his pedagogical work was not confined to the inmates of the palace, but that, like Alcuin, he travelled from place to place with his royal master, opening schools where at all feasible at the same time that he communicated to those with whom he came in contact, some of the zeal and interest in educational progress which filled his own ardent and devoted soul. In reward for his services he was created abbot of several monasteries, and finally raised to the bishopric of Sherburne, where he died in the year 910. Under such competent guidance Alfred made great progress in his studies, and was enabled gradually to perfect the work of his education which had been begun years before. Though we are told that at the age of twelve he could neither read nor write, by dint of persevering endeavor he soon became remarkable for his attainments in certain departments of learning, and one of the most celebrated men of his times.

Each day he devoted eight hours out of the twenty-four to prayer, study and composition. He applied himself especially to philosophy, geometry, music and architecture. At the age of thirty-nine he took up Latin, which he mastered sufficiently to enable him to compose in it several works of no mean desert, as well as to translate others into the vernacular—amongst them being "Liber Pastoralis Curæ" by Gregory the Great; "De Consolatione Philosophiæ" by Boetius, and "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Venerable Bede, together with selections from the "Soliloquies of Saint Augustine." His proficiency in the Saxon tongue, in which he wrote numerous poems, was also remarkable. Add to which the practical turn of his genius, which enabled him to bring to bear upon the material and intellectual advancement of his kingdom whatever knowledge he acquired. "In a word," says Edmund Burke, summing up his excellent qualities, "he comprehended in the greatness of his mind the whole of government and its parts at once, and, what is most difficult to human frailty, was at the same time sublime and minute."[1] A character of such diversified worth was well suited to become the chief

[1] *Abridgement of English History*, Book II.

instrument of educational reform at an epoch and in conditions sufficiently dark and desperate. Like the humblest child he sat at the feet of Asser in the Palace School, and gave peremptory orders that all the officials of his kingdom should set the same example of diligence and love of self-improvement by applying themselves immediately and earnestly to the cultivation of learning. If loath to do so, they were to be dismissed from their offices forthwith. To facilitate the execution of his command, he enlisted the services of whatever learned men there were in Britain. These were none too numerous. He himself in a letter to Wulsige had deplored their lamentable scarcity.[1] Nothing daunted, however, by the obstacles in his way, he sent abroad to solicit aid from other nations—not merely petitioning for scholars to conduct his schools, but even for monks to people his cloisters, the rude Saxon not having developed as yet any particular relish for that species of life. Not only Wales, as we have seen, but Flanders, Germany and France were put under contribution to supply the deficiency. Perhaps the two most prominent whom he succeeded in obtaining were John, surnamed "the Old Saxon," who is thought to have received his education at the monastery of Corby in Westphalia, and Grimbald. Both were monks and priests. The former he put in charge of the monastic establishment at Ethelingey. He is sometimes confounded by historians with John Scotus Erigena, already referred to, and who was not only not abbot of Ethelingey, but most probably, as Dr. Lingard maintains, was never in England at all.[2] Grimbald, if certain accounts be credited, was given the direction of the educational institution at Oxford, whose origin would thus be traceable to the ninth, if not to an earlier, century, with the honor which it so much craves of having Alfred for its founder. The more likely opinion, however, based upon sounder historical criticism, seems to be that all record of Grimbald is lost, and his connection with Oxford is nothing more than a fiction woven of the fancies of certain romantic writers.[3] But

[1] "Adeo funditus concidit," he writes, "apud gentem Anglicanam (learning) ut paucissimi fuerint cis Humbrum, qui vel preces suas communes in sermone Anglico intelligere potuerunt, vel scriptum aliquod a Latino in Anglicum transferre: tam sane pauci fuerunt, ut ne unum quidem recordari possim ex australi parte Thamesis, tum cum ego regnare coeperam." Pastoral of Gregory, *Introduction.*

[2] *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. 11, Note 37. *Historica Ecclesiastica*, Nat. Alexander, vol. xii., c. 9, Art. III.

[3] "The connection of the University of Paris with the Palatine Schools of Charles the Great," says Rashdall, "rests only upon a series of arbitrary assumptions. The theory which traces the origin of Oxford to Alfred the Great aspires to a foundation in contemporary evidence. The Oxford myth was long accepted on the authority of a passage in the Annals of Asser, Bishop of St. David's. The passage is found neither

how bright soever the halo with which a grateful posterity crowns Alfred's work as an educational reformer, it was comparatively scanty, and in all likelihood would have perished with him had not providence raised up in the person of Dunstan, a saintly monk of Glastonbury, where the light of learning still flickered, one who could and did, upon his recall from exile by Edgar, take up the work and bring it to a perfection far beyond Alfred's capabilities. His name, coupled with those of Ethelwald, Oswald, Aelfric and Abbo, will ever be associated with an educational development not altogether barren of results in the history of English civilization. Advancing upon the lines marked out by Alfred, he enlarged his scope and infused into the undertaking a divine power—the gift of saints—which until then it had not known. The work of restoration was pushed diligently forward. Peterborough, Ely, Malmesbury and Thorney rose from their ruins, and no less than forty abbeys were built or restored under his celebrated primacy. Thus the tenth century, from A.D. 924 to A.D. 992, saw the beginning of an upward movement in Britain which was to continue with very little interruption until the multiplied misfortunes of the sixteenth century would pour, like a deluge, over the land.

The experiment made by Alfred to revive learning in England, in imitation of Charlemagne in France, found zealous emulators in Germany in the persons of the Othos, who ruled that country from A.D. 936 to A.D. 1024. Their efforts were as successful as, if not more so than, those in Britain, and form, together with the other two, the only points of relief in the dark ages we are traversing. The pursuit of letters had been steadily on the decline for five hundred years, and, Hallam to the contrary notwithstanding, the general verdict of historians is that it reached its lowest ebb toward the close of the tenth century,which has been not inappropriately styled an age of iron—"*sæculum infelix et obscurum.*"[2]

---

in any extant MS. nor in the earliest printed editions, but made its first appearance in Camden's *Britannia* in 1600 A.D.; whence three years afterwards it was transferred to the edition of Asser. The spuriousness of the passage, which is indeed sufficiently betrayed by its affected classicality of style, was demonstrated as long ago as 1843 in a dissertation appended to the English translation of Huber's *English Universities*. The myth recently received its *coup de grace* at the hands of Mr. James Parker (*The Early History of Oxford*, Oxf. Hist. Soc., 1885). . . . When the supposed authority of Asser is put out of court, the Alfredian legend even in its simplest and least elaborate form, cannot be traced further back than the *Polychronicon* of Ralph Higden, who died in 1363. In fact the whole story with the vast cycle of legend of which it is the nucleus . . . may now be abandoned to students of comparative mythology and of the pathology of the human mind."—*The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, by Hastings Rashdall, vol. ii., part ii., p. 322, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

[1] *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*,. Cave, p. 402.

[2] "En incipit," says Baronius, "annus Redemptoris nongentesimus, tertia indictione

The reason for this lamentable and unparalleled decadence was the destruction of churches and monasteries at the hands of barbaric Normans, Danes and Saracens, whose depredations at this period vividly recalled the invasions of Goth and Visigoth in the fifth and sixth centuries as they swept over the face of Europe, leaving nothing but ruin and desolation in their track. Yet, dark and dismal as the period really was, if we scrutinize the situation closely we will not fail to see that it was not absolutely unproductive of schools and scholars. Both were to be met with at Utrecht, Einsiedeln, Treves, Hildesheim, and in other cities. The same spirit of interest in studies which we have seen at the court of Charlemagne was visible in the populous centres of Germany, and especially within the royal household, where a well-conducted palace school was flourishing. It was fashioned upon the same lines as those presided over by Alcuin and Asser, and aimed at systematizing whatever educational endeavors were possible in an age so unfamiliar with the arts of peace and the institutions of civilized life.[1] Saint Bruno, raised by popular acclaim to the archbishopric of Cologne, and Saint Adelbert to that of Magdeburg, stood out in bold relief as particularly zealous for the educational improvement of their country. Assisted by the unstinted patronage of the Othos and the generous co-operation of a people anxious to learn, the seed of their endeavors fell upon responsive soil and realized a creditable harvest. Injunctions were issued to the bishops ordering them to provide their dioceses with suitable schools. Scholars were brought, especially from Rome, to serve as teachers, and thither students were sent to acquire whatever learning was to be obtained at the heart of Christendom, with the result that not a few, despite the difficulties of the situation, won a fair celebrity for their intellectual attainments. It were needless to recite a mere catalogue of names. Suffice it to say that the two most celebrated scholars who flourished during this epoch

---

notatus, quo et novum inchoatur sæculum, quod sui asperitate ac boni sterilitate ferreum, malique exundantis deformitate plumbeum, atque inopia scriptorum appellari consuevit obscurum."—*Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. x.

Bellarmine says of it, "nullum sæculo decimo indoctius."—*De Controversiis, de R. Pontif.*, lib. iv., c. 12.

[1] Hence to avoid repetition we can afford to be brief in its description. Possibly nothing contributed more generally to the realization of educational results than the hearty co-operation of an episcopacy of which one historian writes: "In no age, perhaps, did Germany possess more learned and virtuous churchmen of the episcopal order than in the latter half of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century."—Introduction to the *Literature of Europe*, Hallam, vol. i., p. 28.

were doubtless Scotus Erigena and the monk Gerbert—solitary lights, so to speak, in a firmament grown almost pitchy dark.[1]

But the darkest hour, so the saw has it, is the one before the dawn. Whether it be so or not ordinarily, in the present case it certainly was. The elements of a great change had been long at work. The change itself was now imminent. Social, political and religious influences long smouldering were about to declare themselves. Their manifestation was to transform Europe, breathe life into the dry bones of the past, and give birth to a civilization whose shibboleth was to be educational reform. It is no easy matter, even for the philosopher of history, to trace to its certain causes the general revival which unmistakably sets in with the eleventh century. The spirit of chivalry, the Crusades, the birth of commerce, the formation of European languages, the multiplication of religious orders, the secularization and specialization of learning, and the introduction into Europe from the East of a system of philosophy peculiarly adapted to stimulate mental exertion, are all advanced as having more or less influenced the turn in the tide so noticeable at this time. To speak of the principal. Chivalry, at once the effect and concomitant of feudalism, with its exalted regard for personal honor and womanly dignity, certainly did much to steady the jarring elements of the barbaric ages in which it flourished and lift men's thoughts and aspirations from the rude to the refined, from the actual to the possible, from the real to the ideal. The tales of scald and bard; the songs of troubadours and minnesingers, woven upon the romance of love and rehearsed far and near in wooded bower or castle hall, were in-

[1] As the eleventh century opened in the darkness of the tenth, so its close ushered in the dawn of an epoch ever memorable as a transition period in the history of Christian education. The forces which effected the tremendous change had been silently and imperceptibly at work for years, maybe for centuries, meanwhile held in abeyance by the deplorable social and moral condition of the times. With the advent of new and more favorable circumstances, however, they were free to declare themselves and did so with permanent and universal effect. Nowhere was their influence felt more lastingly than in the schools, both monastic and cathedral, which from this point on—from Anselm to Peter the Lombard—are scarcely recognizable as identical with their former selves. An altogether new spirit had taken possession of them. Their resources were being multiplied daily, while the whole trend of their steady development was in the direction of the universities into which they were to be eventually merged. Of their relation, *in transitu*, to the universities, and of the universities themselves—their organization and constitution—we hope to speak somewhat in detail later. For a summary account of the transition to which we allude, the reader is referred to *Saint Thomas of Aquin*, Vaughn, pp. 76–77; *Rise and Constitution of Universities*, Laurie, Lect. vi., pp. 96 *et seq.* For an elaborate treatment of the entire subject, vid. *History of the Universities of the Middle Ages Before* 1400, Denifle; *The Universities of the Middle Ages*, Rashdall; *Idea of a University* and *Rise and Progress of Universities*, Newman (*Historical Sketches*, vol. iii.).

deed a summons to something higher. They were an incentive to a social condition in which delicate fancy and noble sentiment, touchstones of mental refinement, were allowed full scope and activity. Allied to religion, the chivalric spirit did more. It purified and elevated while it supernaturalized the lives and hopes of men, affording them through the darkness from which they were emerging clearer glimpses of another order of life, moral in character, and founded upon the immutable principles of Christian beauty and truth. It was the dawn of a new civilization, broader and nobler than aught they had ever known, and the national as the individual heart throbbed in responsive unison with its invitation to higher and better things. The Crusades, too, whatever objections may be alleged against them on other grounds, contributed largely to the revival of which we are speaking. Until the voice of Peter the Hermit sounded the call to arms throughout Europe and rallied to a common cause so many nations differing in character and thoroughly antagonistic, men's lives were comparatively insulated. There was little travel and almost no interchange of ideas. What knowledge there was stood, as it were, in stagnant pools awaiting some mystic touch to quicken it into marvelous life. For want of motion and friction it lacked the vigor which alone could insure its rapid and steady growth. Ireland, England and Germany had indeed made the world their debtors by sending their scholars hither and thither; but the coming and going of a few only helped to emphasize the defect in the general situation. But with the uprising of multitudes the result was quite different. As army met army, as they moved in thousands from place to place, they awoke as from a dream, and what they heard and saw came to them with the force of a revelation. New ideas, new institutions, new scenes, new nations, new laws, new customs, new social and political systems, new libraries, new scholars, new educational facilities, the varied products of the arts and sciences and the fruits of every industry were all a most effectual mental stimulus. What they had seen and heard only made them the more eager upon returning home to see and hear more, while it formed the endless burden of romantic stories which excited others to set out in quest of similar information. The secularization of learning was also acting as a potent factor at this crisis. It is true, there had always existed what were known as "adventure" or private schools, whose professors eked out a livelihood shifting from place to place and teaching wherever the experiment seemed to pay. But they were conducted in a manner in harmony with the Christian ages in which they flourished. Now, however, a change was

coming over their condition. Their number was increasing. The store of learning which they carried was growing every day more considerable, while a spirit of mental unrest was fast developing in their midst. Practically divorced from religion, they wanted the safeguards which the monasteries had once supplied. A dangerous spirit of ambitious rivalry soon took possession of them which, while it had the advantage of opening up wider fields of research, was in not a few instances fraught with the still greater disadvantage of not knowing where to draw the line upon its investigations. In its wild chase after the elusive phantom of knowledge it too often overlooked its higher obligations and contributed not a little to foster the sceptical spirit of the heresies which began to crop up at this time, and which, in their deification of reason, repudiated the supreme and inalienable claims of divine faith. But among the various forces at work we must not omit to mention the introduction into the West of the philosophy of the East with its disposition to inquiry and its endless metaphysical refinings. Europe was ripe for it.

Heretofore education had moved in a beaten track. It had been traditional rather than discursive. It had contented itself with guarding and quoting the wisdom of antiquity without attempting to open up new vistas or cut new paths through the unexplored realms of the mind. Original research was almost unknown. Augustine and Gregory Thaumaturgus might be cited, but to venture a new treatise upon the nature and province of grace were a boldness akin to impiety. Such a state of affairs could not endure. Too many problems were pressing for solution and all that was needed to give it was a scientific method of investigation which, while it would throw the searchlight of the subtlest mental acumen into the darkest corners of the most abstruse subjects, could not fail to harmonize, in the rounded fullness of a universal accord, the natural with the supernatural, the human with the divine, the principles of revelation with the laws of perpetual progress. The birth of scholasticism, for such was the name which it assumed in Christian hands, marks a prominent point of departure in the intellectual history of Europe. The Aristotelian or Peripatetic philosophy had been imported from Greece and popularized by Arab commentators. Saracenic invasion introduced it into Europe by way of Spain, and it was not long ere it was caught up and assimilated into the life of the leading educational institutions of the West. Cleared of its pagan dross, it was easily moulded into an effective instrument in the hands of saints and scholars, and made to serve the higher and

holier purpose of an aid to the fuller illustration, by rational methods, of the truths of the gospel. It took speedy possession of the existing schools; infused new vitality into the studies of the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*, imparting to them a life and a relish they had never known before. The quiet atmosphere of the class-room became alive with the fire of disputation. The fervor spread from institution to institution. Students thronged from everywhere to the various schools, until their number became so great as to necessitate an increase of lecturers and an organization sufficiently compact and effective to hold this eager and turbulent body in due control. The enthusiasm which had formerly marked the lectures of Gerbert and Scotus was now aroused by numerous professors who could drink of the same fountain of wisdom without crossing the threshold of their respective monasteries. Which of all these forces was the most operative it were impossible to say. While Paulsen emphasizes the Crusades and Professor Laurie the secularization of education, Cardinal Newman insists upon the Greek philosophy as the most effective and significant force then at work.

The age of the Universities had not yet come. Still who can fail to see in the features which distinguish this transitional epoch the dawnings of that activity which in the twelfth century would be thrown into definite shape and in the fifteenth would strike the zenith of its development for the weal of some and the woe of others? Professors and departments in the various schools were multiplied. Studies were organized. Superior schools were started in great numbers as supplementary aids in the shadow of great educational centres. A system of interdependence, co-ordinate and subordinate, was forming amongst the various institutions. Learning, as well as the methods adopted for its inculcation, was assuming a universal character which was gradually lifting education from the contracted and hampering environments of the past to the world-wide field it was destined to range after a few years. Who was the master spirit of the hour can only be surmised. The names of Anselm, Lanfranc, William de Champeaux, Abelard and others, pass in celebrated train before us in answer to the question. Laurie finds even in the rebellion of Berengarius and the rationalism of Scotus sufficient explanation of the great awakening as he conceives it. This much, however, do know—that in the monastery of Le Bec, in Normandy, especially under the regencies of Lanfranc and Anselm, the new philosophy was chastened and wedded to theological truth in a way to establish its practical value when properly applied, and thus

was furnished with credentials which made it welcome wherever it went;[1] that it was in and about the School of Paris that the new life was manifesting itself most strikingly. Having passed through the various stages of a long development, that institution was now preparing more evidently and rapidly than ever, under the salutary influences of position and patronage, to assume at the end of the eleventh century the higher role of university, and thus merit for itself the distinction of having led off in the great transformation so near at hand. Incidentally, and while the scene is shifting, it is interesting to observe, as an unmistakable sign of her zeal for educational progress, how the Church, as she had done her utmost to save the relics of ancient learning in the dark days of barbaric invasion, in the present emergency contributes her vast and varied influence towards lifting it on to the higher plane for which it was certainly making.[2] She favored rational investigation—the application of philosophy to dogma—provided it were distinguished throughout by a humility and faith which could recognize and respect the claims of revelation as against the assumptions of a vain and unbridled reason. With her blessing and cooperation, with the favor of the State as well, with the combined energies of inspirited multitudes, the forces now set in motion were not to be stopped, but moved on powerfully to their appointed ends—to their far-reaching and lasting results. The night had passed. The day was slowly breaking.

Rev. Eugene Magevney, S. J.

Saint Ignatius College, Chicago, Ill.

---

[1] *The Life and Times of Saint Anselm.* Rule.

[2] For an enumeration of various councils convened by the Church in behalf of popular education, especially during the ninth century, *cf. The Bible in the Middle Ages.* Buckingham.

# THE RECOLLETS AT DETROIT DURING NEARLY ALL THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

THE Catholic Church, under whose auspices the Western World was discovered, whose ministers first brought the light of Christianity to the aboriginal nations possessing the soil of North and South America, and first explored the extensive regions lying between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, has, to use the words of the "silver-tongued orator" of the Catholic Congress of Baltimore in 1889, "set its broad seal on American soil."

On no part of the American domain was this seal more firmly set than on the fair region which we propose to designate as the North and the South littorals of the Detroit, where the Catholic Church was first established under the auspices of Catholic France.

Neither the political events during which the flag of a ruling power has been changed five times on the North littoral, nor the progressive expanse of a great city under American rule, has weakened the tenacity of the seal of the Catholic Church.

The closing years of the nineteenth century suggest the fact that the Eternal Sacrifice which was first offered in this locality by Catholic priests in July, 1701, on the high bluff of the strait, which has since become the commercial centre of the city of Detroit, with her 300,000 or more inhabitants, has been continuously offered by priests and prelates during the two centuries succeeding the erection of the first Catholic chapel on these shores.

But before religion had been established, the strait leading into Lake Erie had been recognized in New France as of strategic importance to the maintenance of French supremacy in the Northwest regions.

To the English it was the gateway of water-communication between Lake Erie and New York and the fur-trading regions of lake and forest from Lake Huron to Lake Superior, exploited and held by the French, but ardently coveted by the English traders.

To the French the control of the strait would secure protection against hostile approach from the lower lakes, or from any attempt to enter Lake Huron by way of Lake Erie.[1] The French could reach Lake Huron from Canada by way of the Ottawa River,

[1] A study of the map of the waterways between Lakes Erie and Huron will show the strategic importance of the strait between Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie.

and by water and portage communications to the Georgian Bay; and this was the route usually taken by military and trading expeditions from Canada for nearly a century. It is claimed by Rameau and other historians that there was a frontier rendezvous on the strait where the city of Detroit now stands, during the seventeenth century, and that La Salle, who crossed Lake Erie in the "Griffon" in 1679, having on board his vessel Fathers Membré, Hennepin and Ribourd, and the Chevalier Henry de Tonty, when passing up the strait, tarried at this rendezvous. Father Hennepin and the Chevalier de Tonty in their respective narratives describe the natural beauty of the approach to the locality, the forest-lined shores, the green meadows, the beautiful birds and the abundance of game they saw, with much admiration. Charlevoix in his seventeenth letter, written at Detroit forty-two years later, corroborates the description of the scenery as given by the companions of La Salle.

In 1693 the French Government had under consideration the advisability of establishing a fort at the site of this rendezvous on the strait. Among the officers called upon to report upon the lake frontier was the Chevalier Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac, who had been commandant of Michilimacinac and its dependencies.[1] The memoir submitted by this young officer upon the status of the Western Lake Indian nations, and their political relations with the nations of the Iroquoian Confederacy of New York, attracted attention in the cabinet of Louis XIV., and especially of the Count de Pontchartrain, Minister of the Marine and Colonies, not only for its comprehensiveness, but more particularly for the reasons assigned for constructing permanent works of defence at this strategic locality.

He also advocated the planting of a colony of Frenchmen on the strait and the concentration in the vicinity of the proposed military post of all the Indian nations inhabiting the shores and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan, for permanent settlement, whose warriors, allied with the French, would make a combined force which the English and their Iroquoian allies could not overcome. Definite action at the time on the part of the Government

---

[1] Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac, born at St. Nicholas de la Grave, Tarn and Garonne, France, 1658; officer of distinction in Canada, 1686; Chevalier of St. Louis; Seigneur of Mount Desert, 1689; Commandant at Michilimacinac, 1694; founder and Governor of Detroit, 1701–1710; Governor of Louisiana, 1710–1717; returns to France; Governor of Castelsarasin, Tarn and Garonne, 1722–1730; obiit, October 15, 1730.—Farmer's *History of Detroit*, pp. 226–330.

of France was probably deferred by the adverse influence of the monopolists controlling the trade of New France.[1]

In 1700 the Chevalier Cadillac went to France and explained his plans to Count de Pontchartrain. He asked for a grant of land for his proposed colony, for 100 soldiers, for as many more colonists, the necessary outfit for such an expedition, with money for its support during the initial years of its establishment. He received his commission as Governor, the grant of lands, and an order on the Governor-General of New France for the men, money and stores; and, returning to Canada in 1701, commenced the organization of his initial expedition.

But de Calières, the Governor-General, was unable to furnish more than fifty soldiers and the same number of artisans and farmers for colonists—in all, about half the number authorized by the French Government.

The expedition, which comprised twenty-five bark trading-canoes,[2] left Trois Rivières June 5, 1701, taking the route by the Ottawa River, and across, by rivers, lakes and portages, to the Georgian Bay, thence through Lake Huron down to Lake St. Clair, into the strait leading to Lake Erie,[3] the Chevalier Cadillac in command; Alphonse de Tonty, captain; Dugué and Chacornacle, lieutenants; Father De Lhatte, Recollet, to be chaplain of the future post; and Father Vaillant, S. J., for missionary work among the Indians at their intended settlements.

After a journey of forty-four days the Chevalier Cadillac entered the strait, and arrived at the locality of the old rendezvous July 21, 1701, and assumed possession of his domain.

The bluffs on both sides of the strait at its narrowest point were high: a landing-place was selected about a mile below the old rendezvous, on the northwest side, at the mouth of a small river,[4] where the shore was low and sandy. The expedition was disembarked, and a military camp established.[5] The site of the

---

[1] *La Compagnie du Canada*, whose stockholders were mostly residents of Paris.

[2] The capacity of a trading bark canoe was four tons of freight. It could be carried on the shoulders of four men across the portages without its freight; the latter usually followed on hand-trains.

[3] This route was taken in preference to the shorter one by way of Lake Erie, to escape the vigilance of the Senecas, hereditary guardians of the "Western Door" of the "Long House," as the "Country of the Lakes" of New York was called, between the Hudson River and Lake Erie, the home of the Nations of the Iroquoian Confederacy.

[4] The Savoyard River, which has since disappeared.

[5] "The successful termination of the first move in this bold enterprise," writes Rameau, in his *Notes Historiques*, "was highly creditable to its commander." Canada, at the time, had a population of about 21,000 souls. From her sparse settlements

future post was located at the narrowest part of the strait, on the bluff.

Four *arpents* were marked out for stockade inclosure, inside of which two hundred square feet were reserved for defensive works, the construction of which was immediately commenced. The fort was built of heavy square timber laid as in mason work, having four bastions. Its position was designed to command any approach by land or water, while affording protection to all Frenchmen. It was named, in honor of the patron of the colony, Fort Pontchartrain.[1]

The chapel, built in the same inclosure as the fort, was named in honor of St. Anne, on whose festival, July 26, 1701, it was commenced. The dwellings for temporary use were all alike, and built of upright timber—simply extensive cabins roofed with bark and made habitable by the methods customary in frontier life.

"Here, then," says General Cass, "commences the history of Detroit, and with it the history of Michigan. How numerous and diversified are the incidents compressed within the period of its existence!

"No place in the United States presents such a series of events interesting in themselves and permanently affecting, as they occurred, its progress and prosperity. Its flag has been changed five times, three different sovereignties have claimed its allegiance,

---

Cadillac selected his men; but his frontier experience enabled him to engage such adventurers as might be relied upon, whose intelligence and courage would be likely to stand the ordeal of the dangers of his expedition. "It is a proof of his great influence," continues Rameau, "that he succeeded in inducing so many to leave their homes and friends, and follow him to a far-distant wilderness, in a journey of 600 miles, exposed to hostile Indian attack, with the possibility that after its termination the whole command might be massacred before assistance from the nearest friendly quarter in Canada could reach the scene."

[1] Louis Philippeau, Count de Pontchartrain, Minister of the Marine and Colonies under Louis XIV., 1690–99, when he succeeded Boucherat as Chancellor, and retired in 1714. His son, Jerome Philippeau, Count de Pontchartrain, succeeded his father as Minister of the Marine and Colonies, 1699, and retained his portfolio until the death of the "Grand Monarch." Count Jerome was the patron of the Colony of Detroit, and probably a friend of its founder. He insured its success in spite of the intrigues and the persistent opposition of its enemies, both in Canada and in France—the wealthy monopolists of the *Compagnie du Canada*, whose directors in Paris sought its destruction from the time of its inception. This tribute is due to his memory.

Cabinet council work under Louis XIV. was most thorough; this is evident, so far as the affairs of the colony founded by the Chevalier Cadillac is concerned, from the marginal notes on nearly all the documents in the archives of the Marine and Colonies relating thereto.

It is a curious historical fact that the anti-Jesuit ranting and the calumnies of the Chevalier Cadillac against the Jesuit missionaries contained in his dispatches to La Touche, Under-Secretary of State, were controverted in royal councils by the venerable Jesuit, Father La Chaise, confessor of the King.

and since it has been held by the United States its government has been thrice transferred; twice it has been besieged by the Indians, once captured in war, and once burned to the ground."[1]

In pursuance of his proposed plan to colonize the Indians in the vicinity of Fort Pontchartrain, the Chevalier Cadillac sent messengers to the nations inhabiting the littoral and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan, inviting their tribes to leave their cantons, "to bring their families, and to come down and make new homes in the vicinity of the post, where the climate was mild, the soil fertile, game abundant, a storehouse for barter, and ample protection assured." His influence over the lake tribes was such that most of the Hurons and Ottawas abandoned their homes and came to the post.

The Huron tribes built their canton and fort about a mile below the post, while lower down on the shore of the strait were located the cantons of the Miami and Pottawotomi tribes.

The Chevalier Cadillac located the Ottawa tribes on the opposite side of the strait, on the high bluff about a mile southeast, where they built their cantons and strong defensive works.

After the fort and stockade had been completed, small tracts of land outside the post on the shore above were assigned the farmer colonists and married soldiers; advances of seed-grain, implements, and other supplies were made to encourage the tillage of the soil from the allowance granted by the King; while shelter within the stockade was assured to all Frenchmen.

But the difficulties confronting the tillers of the soil were great; there were no horses, no cattle; the clearage of timber and the preparation of the soil for planting had to be done with the axe and spade—in other words, by hand-labor.

Meanwhile the chase and the fisheries became valuable auxiliaries in the supply of good and wholesome food.

Had the Chevalier Cadillac received that support from the Colonial authorities of New France intended by the Government of France, the success of his enterprise in the founding of the colony of Detroit would never have been doubtful. But, as we have stated, the success of his enterprise on the plans proposed would seriously affect the interests of the monopoly controlling by royal charter nearly all the trade of French America. While the removal of the people of the Indian tribes from their homes on the littorals and islands of the upper lakes and colonizing these tribes in the vicinity of Fort Pontchartrain would demoralize the

[1] Cass: Discourse before the Historical Society of Michigan at Detroit, 1830.

richest field of the fur-trade of the *Compagnie du Canada*, these consequences had been foreseen, and their effect upon the profits of the rich monopoly had been estimated so adversely, that the destruction of any colony on the plan proposed and the crushing of its projector had been determined by the Paris directors, even before the initial expedition had started from Trois Rivieres.

These, it is true, were commercial considerations. More serious, however, were the results to be expected from this Indian hegira in a religious point of view.

Michilimacinac was the headquarters of the missionary system of the Western lake regions, which included the people of the tribes of the respective nations the Chevalier Cadillac proposed to colonize near Fort Pontchartrain.

The conversion to Christianity of most of these Indians had been effected during the seventeenth century by the labor, which in some instances had been attended by the martyrdom, of some of the saintliest fathers of the Society of Jesus.

The removal of these Christian Indians from the spiritual control of the missionary fathers, which control had been independent of the jurisdiction of the military commandants of Michilimacinac, and their concentration and settlement as proposed, would expose them to contact with the white race, while religious control would become subordinate to the dictates of the military commandants, which had not always been in harmony with the Christian rule of the missionary fathers. Experience had proved that such contact had resulted in the demoralization of the weaker race, and that Christian Indians who had been exposed to it were likely to lapse to debauchery, if not to Paganism, with deplorable consequences to the peace and welfare of their families.[1]

It resulted, therefore, that the heroic enterprise of the Chevalier Cadillac, in founding the post and colony at Fort Pontchartrain, was destined to encounter the serious opposition of two of the most powerful elements in all New France; the one altogether commercial, which already virtually controlled the colonial officials; the other of a purely religious combination, with great influence in America and in Europe.

---

[1] The Chevalier Cadillac, while in command at the post of Michilimacinac, had championed the cause of the French traders when the missionaries sought to suppress the sale of *eau de vie* to their Indian neophytes, which caused misery in their families and endangered their souls. Their beneficent opposition to this evil resulted in a bitter controversy, maintained by the Chevalier.

But the missionaries sought the intervention of the French Government and their cause was sustained. The Chevalier, rankling under this signal defeat, never ceased to misrepresent and even to revile the Jesuit Fathers.

While the directors of the *Compagnie du Canada* opposed this enterprise with unscrupulous methods, the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec, while not co-operating, refrained from opposing the founding of a colony sanctioned by the Government of France.

It is probable the situation was fully explained to the Provincial of the order in Paris at the time, and by the latter to Father La Chaise, the venerable confessor of Louis XIV.; we have, however, no knowledge of such epistolary record.

The first intimation the Chevalier Cadillac received of the non-concurrence of the Father Superior at Quebec was the prompt withdrawal of Father Vaillant de Guestis while the expedition was still encamped. The recall of this distinguished Iroquoian missionary and Indian diplomat[1] annoyed and angered the chevalier, for his dispatches and correspondence on file in the French archives are in evidence of the fact. It was an unexpected and a very serious disarrangement of his plans for the utilization of the several thousand Indians who were to be gathered by his influence to the vicinity of Fort Pontchartrain.

While the Chevalier Cadillac was laying the foundation of the post and colony of Detroit, its wealthy enemies in Paris were scheming for its destruction. In the fall of 1701 Governor de Calières was instructed that it was the King's command that the posts of Detroit and Frontenac were to be placed in charge of the *Compagnie du Canada*, who would reimburse the Government for the cost of their establishment and assume the expense of their future maintenance. The Governor was directed to convene a council of the notables of Canada and of the seven directors of the company, to arrange the conditions of these transfers. This council was held at the Chateau of St. Louis, in Quebec, October 31, 1701. It was an *ex parte* assembly of men in the interest of the company, who were opposed to the colony of Detroit. The chevalier could not be present, while his friends in Canada were excluded. Its proceedings were drawn up in a *procès verbal* as a "treaty" between the representatives of the Crown on one side and the directors of the *Compagnie du Canada* on the other, and certified by a royal notary.

By its terms the military tenure of the Crown remained vested

---

[1] Rev. Francis Vaillant de Gueslis, S.J., ordained at Quebec, 1675. Missionary at Fort Hunter, 1679. With the Mohawks, 1683, whence he retired at the breaking up of the missions in the Iroquoian cantons. Chaplain of Denonville's expedition against the Senecas, 1687. Envoy to Governor Dongan, at New York, 1688. At Detroit, 1701. Missionary in the Seneca cantons, 1703–7, whence he returned to Quebec. (See Charlevoix for later mention.)—New York Doc. 9, 762.

in the respective commandants, who were to have control over military affairs; but they were forbidden, under severe penalties, to take any part in their trade or commerce, which was placed under the exclusive control of the factors of the monopoly. It is doubtful if this was intended by Louis XIV., or if the so-called "treaty" ever received the royal sanction.[1] On July 18, 1702, the annual convoy from Quebec arrived at Fort Pontchartrain, bringing a dispatch from Governor de Calières citing the royal mandate, accompanied with an official copy of the "treaty," and instructions to turn over to the factors of the monopoly, who came with the convoy, the stores and property of the Crown at Fort Pontchartrain. The Chevalier Cadillac was further instructed to make such arrangement with the three factors as would conform to the conditions of the "treaty" in their future government of the post and colony.

The chevalier was too good a soldier to refuse obedience; he surrendered his civil functions, confident that in time the Government, in the interests of New France, would restore him to full control over the post and colony.

For five years the *Compagnie du Canada* ruled at Fort Pontchartrain, during which time its founder had been arrested and subjected to legal persecutions at Quebec, while, in the meantime, Governor de Calières, who was an honest ruler, had died and had been succeeded by the Marquis de Vaudréuil, who was a nephew of the Sieur Lotbinière, of Quebec, a leading director of the monopoly in New France. The Chevalier Cadillac, in an exhaustive document, addressed Count de Pontchartrain, in which the history of the colony during six years, the manner in which he had been persecuted, and the schemes of the company for breaking up the colony were minutely related. He asked that the company be withdrawn, and that the control of the post in the interest of the colony and of New France be restored to him with increased power, and demanded a grant of money to enable him to procure additional colonists and develop its growth.

This document, which is on file in the archives of the Marine and Colonies at Paris, shows, from its many marginal notes, that it was carefully considered in the cabinet councils held by Louis XIV. The Chevalier Cadillac was sustained. The *Compagnie du Canada* was withdrawn, while the Marquis de Vaudréuil was sharply reprimanded and narrowly escaped the disgrace of dis-

[1] This is also the opinion of Judge Campbell, author of *Outlines of the Political History of Michigan.*

missal.[1] The privileges of the monopoly were greatly restricted.[2] The people of New France were relieved from an incubus which had dwarfed commercial enterprise, which had corrupted public functionaries, and which had to some extent demoralized the youth and manhood of the agricultural classes.

Upon the return of the Chevalier Cadillac to Detroit after his prolonged detention at Quebec, he found Captain Bourgmont in temporary command and the establishment so badly demoralized that his worst enemies would have been satisfied with the situation. The garrison had been reduced, but the soldiers had received neither pay nor clothing from the company for three years. Some of the colonists had left the post and were engaged in fur-trading.

In the meantime the post had been attacked by hostile Indians, while the chaplain, Father Constantin, had been treacherously killed by an Indian's bullet. Bourgmont, however, was a good officer, and with the assistance of the friendly tribes in the vicinity the post was saved from capture and pillage.

But French prestige over the 3000 or more Indians domiciled near Detroit had been weakened; to restore this the Chevalier Cadillac had to use sharp measures. Every effort was now made by its founder to re-establish the colony on a sound basis. The garrison of the post was increased, additional colonists and artisans, horses, cattle, agricultural implements, and seed-grain were brought from Canada, while a grist-mill was erected.

The storehouse was well stocked, but the Chevalier Cadillac made stringent regulations for the sale of *eau de vie* to colonists and Indians alike. He was now commandant of the post and seigneur of the colony; as such he made grants of land to colonists and issued licenses to fur-traders.

Soon after the hegira of the Indian tribes from the littorals and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan and their settlement near the post, the Jesuit Fathers abandoned their missions in that locality; the venerable Father de Carheil burned the chapel and mission house at Michilimacinac, the scene of his depopulated missionary centre, and sorrowfully returned to his brethren at Quebec.[3]

While the Chevalier Cadillac, under the protection of the Count de Pontchartrain, had defeated the machinations of one of the

[1] See Pontchartrain's letter in *Margry*, 5, 348.

[2] N. Y. Col. Doc. 9, 777.

[3] See *in re* the instructions of Louis XIV. to Governor-General de Vaudréuil in *Margry*, 5, 345.

greatest monopolies existing in Europe or in America to wipe out the post and colony at Detroit, his correspondence on file in the archives at Paris proves that his documentary warfare against the Jesuit missionaries all through the decade of his career at the post was continuous and bitter.

It seems to us that his bitter sarcasms and calumnious insinuations was the great mistake of his adventurous career, and had the effect of weakening the confidence of his influential protector, the Minister of the Marine and Colonies, while having more or less influence in shaping its disappointing termination at Detroit.

In a few years the colony at Detroit, under the energetic administration of its founder, took deep root, while its population and trade increased.

The Indian tribes in the vicinity lived in peace; the warriors went to their hunting-fields and returned with their packs of furs, which were bartered to advantage at the storehouse of the post. The Indian women cultivated the prolific soil, whose harvests filled their granaries, leaving a surplus of grain and vegetables which was also sold.

Such was the status when in 1710 M. de La Mothe Cadillac was appointed Governor of Louisiana, which part of New France extended from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific.

It was an administrative position of great importance, with headquarters at what is now New Orleans. Whether this appointment had been made in the interest of France or had been dictated by adverse influence is a question; we incline to the opinion that it was by the latter. If, however, the enemies of the colony had brought about the removal of its founder with the expectation that it would decline and be abandoned, they were disappointed in the result.[1]

The crucial period in its existence was during the second decade, which to some extent was tragic; it languished, then recovered. Thanks to the brave colonists, it grew and prospered.

---

[1] The succeeding commandants of the post were: 1711–1712, du Buisson; 1712–1714, de la Forest; 1714–1717, Charles Sabrevois; 1717, de Louvigny; 1717–1720, Henri de Tonty, cadet; 1720, de Noyelle; 1720–1727, Alphonse de Tonty; 1727, de Lepernouche; 1728, de St. Ours; 1728–1734, de Boishebert, during whose administration the colony made great progress; 1734, de Livandière; 1734–1738, Charles Sabrevois; 1738–1741, de Noyelle; 1741–1742, de Noyan; 1742–1743, de Celeron; 1743–1750, de Longueuil; 1751–1754, de Celeron; 1754–1758, de Muy; 1758–1760, de Bellestre. It fell to the latter, François Marie Picote, one of the most distinguished of the French rulers of the post, to lower the standard of France to the "border ranger," Major Robert Rogers, who had been sent with a company of New York rangers by General Amherst, after the capitulation of Montreal, to take possession. These abbreviated details may be studied *in extenso* in Farmer's *History of Detroit*, p. 227.

Under Beauharnois, Governor-General of New France, 1726–1747, who fully appreciated its importance, the colony was greatly favored, while inducements offered to colonists stimulated the emigration of a superior class of agriculturists and artisans, who secured grants of land and became permanent residents. In fact the soil was very prolific, while the climate was much more agreeable than that of Canada; which facts becoming known, Detroit came to be considered a desirable location for young married couples who had new homes to acquire and fortunes to create.

The wise policy of Beauharnois was continued by his successors.

There was no longer any protected opposition to the colony. The blight of the monopoly of *La Compagnie du Canada* had been replaced by commercial activity. External wars were, however, destined to change the political status of New France.

As we have stated, the Recollet friar, Nicolas Bernardin Constantine de Lhalle, was appointed by Governor-General de Calières *aumônier* of the initial expedition to establish the post and colony of Detroit, and he accompanied its leader, the Chevalier Cadillac, in his perilous journey from Trois Rivières to its termination.

It was apparently under the direction of this Recollet father that the primitive chapel was completed; it was dedicated in the manner stated to Ste. Anne.[1]

We have seen no authentic account of the birthplace, the education, or of the ordination of Father De Lhalle.

His name indicates gentle lineage, he was probably inspired with a vocation for the sacerdotal state, and after his ordination he offered himself for Indian missionary work in New France.

According to Monseigneur Tanguay,[2] he came from France to Quebec in 1696; his age at the time is not stated. He officiated at Longueil in 1698. He is said by the same authority to have been pastor of the church of St. Francis de Sales, the locality of which is not mentioned.

The first chapel of Ste. Anne was destroyed by fire, with other buildings near the fort, in 1703. It was promptly replaced by a larger chapel and presbytery.

Father De Lhalle had commenced a baptismal registry on sheets of paper which were burned with the original chapel in 1703.[3]

[1] The chapel was built of hewn timber, the pieces of which were laid one over the other as in mason work.—RAMEAU, *Notes Historiques*, p. 7, Montreal, 1864.

[2] Répertoire Général du Clergé Canadien par ordre Chronologique depuis la Fondation de La Colonie, etc., par Mgr. Ciprien Tanguay, etc., Montreal, 1873.

[3] The loss of these sheets is to be regretted. Father De Lhalle may have rewritten them, or intended doing so. Were they extant, some important questions might be definitely determined which their loss will ever leave in doubt.

On February 2, 1704, the parochial register now used in the church of Ste. Anne of Detroit was commenced. This register has been in use not quite two centuries; it comprises many strongly bound volumes of well-preserved pages, and altogether it is in fine condition. It is written in French; and besides the *actes* of baptisms, marriages and services for the dead, there may be found on its pages the record of important parochial events as they occurred during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is probably the most unique religious and historical manuscript relating to the history of one parish during so long a period in the United States; and it contains the autographs of more priests and ecclesiastical functionaries than can be found in any other parochial record.

It was opened on the date mentioned by Father De Lhalle, when he baptized a daughter of the Chevalier Cadillac. To this entry he attached his own signature, which is followed by those of the sponsors.[1]

During the enforced and continuous detention of the Chevalier Cadillac at Quebec, as stated, hostile tribes from the West and Southwest appeared during the summer of 1706 in the vicinity of the post, which was saved from plunder by the courage and skill of Captain Bourgmont, aided as he was by the friendly tribes who were the allies of the French. Before these hostiles had been defeated in battle, Father De Lhalle, the saintly founder of religion in Detroit, was murdered. He, with the Chevalier Cadillac and others, when the post was first established, had located *arpents* of land outside the stockade for cultivation, and as an example to others which might be followed with advantage.

These *arpents* were on the bluff east of the fort, overlooking

---

[1] The first page in the Register of Ste. Anne is in size about 7 by 9 inches. It is given in fac-simile in Silas Farmer's *Comprehensive History of Detroit*, page 528. It was written by Father De Lhalle, and is as follows:

Baptême de Marie Thérése Cadillac.

"Moi Frere Constantin De Lhalle moine Recollet et aumônier au Fort de Pontchartrain, certifie d'avoir conféré le saint baptême à Marie Thérése, fille légitime de Monsieur Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac commandant pour le Roi au dit Fort, et de Madame Marie Thérése Guion. Le père et mère a eu pour parrain Monsieur Bertrand Arnaud, et pour maraine Mdlle Géneviève le Tendre. En foy de quoy nous avons signé le 2me Février de l'an 1704.

Frere Constantin De Lhalle Recollet.

Arnaud, Géneviève Le Tendre."

On the same page is recorded the baptism of a daughter of Pierre Roy, a *Coureur de Bois*, whose wife was a Miami squaw. It is said Roy and Jacques Pelletier, also a *Coureur*, were domiciled at the old rendezvous when the Chevalier Cadillac's expedition landed. The Indian name of Roy's wife is given as Ou-al-as-ki-kou. The child was baptized Marguerite Roy.

the strait, with attractive surroundings. Father De Lhalle was apparently fond of field-culture, for his garden was well planted, and it was his custom during the flower season to read his breviary daily while walking in his favorite resort. While thus engaged during one of the hostile raids he was seized, but released, presumably by direction of the attacking chief; but as he was about to enter the gate of the stockade he was fired at and killed by one of the hostile Indians.

He was buried in the habit of his order in the chapel.[1]

Such was the tragical ending at the hands of a Pagan savage of the apostolic Recollet, chaplain of Fort Pontchartrain, and the first of the long line of friars of his order who served as pastors of Ste. Anne's of Detroit, 1701–1782.

There may be studied in the Register of Ste. Anne's the testimony of his several successors, which entwines his memory with saintly attributes. The community under the spiritual rule of Father De Lhalle was not a numerous one, but they invoked his intercession to their great advantage, for many were blessed with fervent faith. It is not asking too much of our readers to accept the belief of his venerable successors and of his spiritual children as to his sanctity.

The acccomplished Recollet, Dominique de La Marche, replaced Father De Lhalle. He had been professor of theology in the community of his order in Paris, and had volunteered for missionary work in New France. He arrived at Quebec, according to Tanguay, July 18, 1706.

He left Trois Rivières with the fall convoy of that year bound for Detroit with the appointment, *ad interim*, of chaplain of the post and pastor of Ste. Anne, where he remained until the arrival of his successor in the fall of 1708.

His last entry in the Register of Ste. Anne is dated July 29, 1708, and records a baptism.

He returned to Quebec in 1709, where he was engaged in theological instruction and in occasional missionary work until he was recalled to France in 1733.[2]

The successor of Father De La Marche was the Recollet, Cherubin Deniaux, who had been ordained at Quebec December 3, 1700; his first entry in the Register of Ste. Anne, recording a baptism, is dated January 14, 1709. His pastorate continued

---

[1] This outline corresponds, so far as the tragedy is concerned, with Farmer's account in his *History of Detroit*, p. 529.

[2] Register of Ste. Anne; Tanguay.

until May, 1714, when he was recalled by his Superior to officiate at Beaumont, in the diocese of Quebec.

He died at Montreal in his 65th year in 1732.[1] He was succeeded by the Recollet, Hyacinthe Pelfresne, ordained in France, who arrived at Quebec June 16, 1710. While engaged in missionary work he was sent to Detroit to replace Father Deniaux.[2] His first official entry in the Register of Ste. Anne is dated August 20, 1715, and his last entry March 25, 1718.

He was recalled to Quebec, and subsequently stationed at Trois Rivières, where he died in 1723. There may have been a temporary intermission in the Recollet pastorate between the time of the departure from the post of the return convoy for Canada during the summer of 1718 and the arrival of the fall convoy.

But Father Calvarin, Vicar-General of Foreign Missions, had evidently wintered at the post, for his signature attests an *acte* in the Register of Ste. Anne as early as March 1, 1718. Father Jean Mercier, Priest of the Foreign Missions, records an *acte* August 3, 1718.

De Thaunur, also a Vicar-General of Foreign Missions, was at the post during the summer of 1718. It would appear from the signatures of these venerable officials in the Register that there were several priests at the presbytery of Ste. Anne during the year above mentioned.

The successor of Father Pelfresne was the Recollet, Antoine Delino, who had been ordained at Quebec August 14, 1714. His record shows that he officiated at St. Croix, at Chambly and at Beauport, before going to Detroit.[3]

The last entry of Father Delino in the Register of Ste. Anne is dated March 9, 1722. He was recalled to Quebec the same year. His record shows that he subsequently officiated in the parish of St. Jean, Isle d'Orleans, in 1725. He died at Chambly in November, 1740, and his ashes repose in St. Joseph's Church, Chambly, near Montreal.

Father Delino[4] and his Recollet brother, Thomas Bertrand, were among the priests assisting at the ceremonies of the translation of the remains of St. Vallier, second Bishop of Quebec, to the tomb prepared in the General Hospital of Quebec, which this prelate, who had succeeded the saintly Laval, had founded in 1693. This entombment took place January 2, 1728, under the

---

[1] Register of Ste. Anne; Tanguay. [2] *Ibid.* [3] Tanguay.

[4] Father Delino had for his guest at the presbytery of Ste. Anne, during the summer of 1721, the venerable Father Charlevoix, S.J., who remained three weeks at Detroit.

direction of Eustache Chartier de Lotbiniere, Archdeacon of Quebec.[1]

The Recollet, Father Bonaventura Léonard, who succeeded to the pastorate of Ste. Anne, was ordained at Quebec in 1720, and appointed to Detroit in 1722. His first entry in the Register is dated June 28, 1722. He built the third church of Ste. Anne, and under his direction in 1723 the remains of Father De Lhalle were exhumed and translated with solemn ceremonies to their second resting-place under the altar of the new church. The record of this act of filial devotion is to be found in the Register of Ste. Anne, as written by Father Bonaventure Léonard:

"L'an de Notre Seigneur 1723, 13me jour de Mai, à la rêquisition du Révérend Père Bonaventure, Recollet, aumônier du poste du Detroit ; nous sousignées déclarons nous être transportie sur le terrain ou était ci devant l'église dans laquelle a éte inhumé feu le Reverend Père Constantin De Lhalle, Recollet, faisant les fonctions du aumônier du dit poste, au aprés avoir examiné le lieu où pouvait être son corps suivant l'avis que nous en avait donné le Père Bonaventure, avait engagé deux hommes pour faire l'overture de la terre, lesquelles trousvèront dans la journée le cercueil du dit Révérend Père, lequel a été reconnu être son corps par les marques que chacun a vu, qui sont calotte ; plusieurs morceaux d'êtoffe de son habit, de son caliée de crin bien distingué ; après les examen, le dit Révérend Père Bonaventure fit enlever son corps, le porter á l'église

"En foi de quoi nous assurons a qui l'appartiendra notre attestation véritable.

"Henri Campeau, Hubert Lacroix, Charles Chesne, Xavier Raquetuiade.

"Attesté Léonard Bonaventure."

In the meantime, 1728, Father Armand de La Richardie, S.J., had established on the South littoral of the strait, at the Point de Montreal, nearly opposite Fort Pontchartrain, "*La Mission des Hurons du Detroit*," which prior to the conquest became one of the most extensive missionary establishments in New France.

Father Bonaventure Léonard was recalled to Quebec in 1735, and died there in 1741.[2] He was succeeded by Father Prisque Daniel, whose first entry in the Register is dated August 31, 1735, and his last June 19, 1738.

Father Louis Marie-Bonaventure Carpentier, Recollet, succeeded in 1738. According to Tanguay, he had been ordained at Quebec May 1, 1735, and had officiated at St. Croix before proceeding to Detroit.

He was known at the post as Father Bonaventure, but familiarly called by the habitants "*Père Bon.*" He exercised much influence over the Pottawottomis and Miamis in the vicinity, who gave him the name of "*Robe Gris*," on account of his much-used brown habit; while the Jesuit Fathers at the Huron Mission on

[1] Tanguay.

[2] Tanguay.

the south shore of the strait, whose uniform was black, were called "*Robes Noirs.*" During the pastorate of "*Père Bon*" there was much agreeable intercourse between the latter and the Jesuit Fathers. We find in the Register of Ste. Anne an entry of Father Morinic, S. J., November 1, 1738, and again April 13, 1739.

Father de la Richardie, S. J., Superior of the Huron Mission, records baptisms at Ste. Anne, October 19, 1741, and August 17, 1743. There are other entries of Jesuit Fathers about the same time.

The state of religion at Detroit during the pastorate of Père "Bon" is occasionally indicated by entries in the account-book of the Huron Mission.

Father Pierre Potier, S. J., who made the entries, charges, among others, "Père Bon," June 13, 1743, with 20 livres for 20 masses offered for his intentions. Again, in the following year, 30 livres for 30 masses. In 1750, 50 livres for as many masses.

November 20th of the same year Father Petier made this entry: "Père 'Bon' has directed that 100 masses be offered for his intentions."

Here is evidence that in 1750 the pastor of Ste. Anne was under obligation to offer 150 more masses for his parishioners than he was able to perform, and that in the fulfillment of this duty he had recourse to the Jesuit Fathers across the strait. Considering the difference in the value of money in this locality 150 years ago and the present time, we may consider the relative value of the offering for each service as not far from the dollar of our own times.

Most cordial relations certainly existed. Father Potier adds to this entry: "He has also sent the Fathers of this Mission some home-made cheese, some Gruyère cheese, some snuff, and Spanish tobacco."[1] Father Bonaventure Carpentier was recalled to Quebec in 1754.

He was engaged in missionary work in that city and vicinity twenty-four years.

His forty-three years of sacerdotal life ended there in 1778.[2]

The Recollet Father, Simple Le Bocquet, succeeded the genial and holy friar "Père Bon." He arrived at Detroit August 10, 1754.[3] The third church of Ste. Anne had in the meantime become too small for its parishioners, the second generation of whom

[1] *Livre de Compte de La Mission des Hurons du Detroit.* Translation and annotation, *U. S. Cath. Hist. Magazine*, Vol. IV., pp. 191 *et seq.*

[2] Tanguay. [3] *Ibid.*

had been born on the north littoral of the strait. Father Le Bocquet built and completed the fourth church of the name, and enlarged the presbytery. Its location was on Rue Ste. Anne, some distance west of the site of the third church. It was consecrated with religious, civic and military éclat, March 16, 1755.

The consecrating prelate was Rt. Rev. Henri Marie du Breuil de Pont Briand, sixth Bishop of Quebec, who, from the date of the ceremony, apparently had spent the winter at Detroit and vicinity; for it was hardly possible for the bishop, at that early season of the year, to have made the journey from Quebec by the route of the Georgian Bay or by bateau on Lake Erie.

This venerable prelate, while at Detroit, administered the Sacrament of Confirmation to postulants at Ste. Anne's, and to those of the Jesuit Fathers at the Church of the Assumption at the Huron Mission across the strait.

As an additional evidence of the veneration in which the memory of the saintly founder of religion in Detroit was held by the Recollet Fathers, we translate this official entry in the Register of Ste. Anne:

"July 13, 1755. We, Simple Le Bocquet, Franciscan priest, fulfilling the sacred functions of Chaplain of Fort Pontchartrain, at Detroit, and Rector of Ste. Anne's parish, in the name of King Louis, have transferred from the old church to the new one the remains of our venerable predecessor, Father Constantin De Lhalle, Franciscan missionary, who was killed by the Indians in 1706, while in the performance of his sacred duties, and have deposited them temporarily under the altar until the completion thereof, when we shall give them such final sepulture as becomes his memory *and the miracles wrought through his intercession.*"[1]

It was the fate of Father Le Bocquet to witness the lowering of the lilied standard of his "King Louis" by Commandant Bellestre within six years of the time of the consecrational ceremonies of the fourth Church of Ste. Anne, at Fort Pontchartrain, when the border ranger, Major Robert Rogers, with a company of frontier militia from the Mohawk Valley, arrived at the post to assume control in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Montreal, when General Amherst accomplished the overthrow of French rule over nearly all of New France.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that such a distinguished man as Father Le Bocquet was pastor at Detroit at this crisis in the eventful history of the post, and equally fortunate that he had the advice and co-operation of Father Pierre Potier, S. J., Superior of the Huron Mission on the opposite shore of the strait and pastor of the parish of the Assumption on the south littoral.

[1] Register of Ste. Anne, 1755. The Italics are ours.

The force of Rogers was small, while a combination of Frenchmen capable of bearing arms, with the warriors of the Huron, the Miami, the Pottawottomi and the Ottawa nations, under Pontiac, chief of the latter, could have defied any attempt on the part of the British—for some years, at least—to take and hold the post of Detroit.

It would be a question of time, however, when such opposition would be overcome by an overwhelming force of British troops, while its inevitable result would entail serious consequences to the French and Indian races on both littorals. In restraining such opposition under these serious circumstances, and advising a passive acceptance of the situation, the influence of the respective pastors was exerted wisely and for the best interests of their parishioners, while at the same time the prospective horrors of an Indian war on the frontier was avoided.

With the surrender of Fort Pontchartrain to Rogers was ended the French *régime* on the Detroit.

While the French race in Canada at the time were exclusively of the Catholic faith, and while the majority of their Indian allies were Christian converts, national control had been won on the battle-fields of Quebec and Montreal by the army of an anti-Catholic monarch.

But the religious rights of the people of the conquered domain had been safeguarded in the treaties which consummated the dynastic change and political control made at Quebec, Montreal, and finally at Paris. It was also reserved for the venerable Recollet, Father Le Bocquet, as it was also for the distinguished Jesuit, Father Potier, to watch over the spiritual and temporal interests of their French and Indian constituents during one of the most critical and tragic periods in the history of Detroit.

"The conspiracy of Pontiac," as it is so named in American history, was cradled at Detroit. The home of this most renowned of the American Indian chiefs was at the Ottawa castle on the bluffs of the strait, east of Fort Pontchartrain, across its waters. Most attractive pens have depicted the bloody episodes which crimson the methods of savage warfare as they occurred, and which, in the history of Pontiac, culminated at Detroit. It was a critical time for the French habitants whose sympathies, although covered, were on the side of the Ottawa chief; but it was fatal in its results for the Christian constituents of Fathers Le Bocquet and Potier among the Indian tribes on both littorals of the strait.

The pastorate of Father Le Bocquet ended in 1782, when he returned to Quebec. He had been twenty-eight years at Detroit,

and was the last of the venerable Recollet friars who during eighty-one years had served as pastors of Ste. Anne. His long and useful life was ended in 1787. He had been clothed with vicarial jurisdiction. He and all his saintly predecessors in the pastorate of Ste. Anne wore the brown habit of their order, and next their persons the penitential hair shirt. Father Le Bocquet's successor was Vicar-General Jean François Hubert, who came to Detroit by the spring convoy of 1781.

He was born at Quebec February 23, 1739, and ordained in the Cathedral of that city July 20, 1766. He became secretary to the Bishop, then a director, and for five years was Superior of the Seminary of Quebec before coming to Detroit.

In July following his arrival occurred the accidental death of the venerable Father Pierre Potier, S.J., last of the Huron missionaries, whose obsequies were performed in the Mission Church of the Assumption at Sandwich, by Father Hubert, a record of which in his handwriting, duly attested, and dated July 18, 1781, is to be found in the register of the Assumption parish. Father Hubert assumed control *ad interim* of this church and parish.

After four years of pastoral work on both littorals of the strait Father Hubert was promoted to the episcopacy. In 1785 he became the successor of Laval, and ninth Bishop of Quebec. A translation of his pastoral letter upon the occasion of his departure for Quebec is introduced to show the religious status of the people shortly after the termination of the eighty-one years of the Recollet pastorate at Ste. Anne's, and of the Jesuit missionary work at the Huron church across the strait:

"John Francis Hubert, by the mercy of God and the favor of the Holy Apostolic See Bishop of Quebec, etc., etc., to the inhabitants of the two parishes of Detroit, known under the names of Ste. Anne and the Assumption, health and benediction:

"The happy and peaceful sojourn that I made among you, my very dear brethren, has left in my soul sentiments of attachment and affection so deeply imprinted that you must class among the great consolations of my life that which I now feel in transmitting to you, a public and solemn testimony of my truly pastoral love.

"As you are aware, very dear brethren, the interests and salvation of your souls, the desire to induce you to tread the paths of justice, the hope of preserving in your hearts the maxims of our holy religion which other missionaries had taught you, these were the only motives which led me to you in 1781. If Divine Providence compelled me to leave with tearful eyes a beloved land in which I had hoped to end my days, it has not effaced from my memory the frequent instructions I gave you nor the pleasure with which you seemed to hear them."[1]

Rev. Louis Payst, succeeded to the pastorate of Ste. Anne, who in 1786 was transferred to Michilimacinac. He was succeeded

[1] Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 468.

the same year by Very Rev. Pierre Frechette, who had been ordained at Quebec in December, 1784. Father Frechette was the last of the incumbents of Ste. Anne under the see of Quebec. His pastorate extended during ten years—1786–1796. During the latter year the British Government were forced to retire to the line established by treaty more than a decade previously, evacuating Detroit, which came under control of the United States.

The pastorate of Father Frechette was marked by the advent of the first Irish priest ever officiating in Michigan as early as the eighteenth century. This was Very Rev. Edmund Burke, who seemed to have been clothed with general vicarial powers from the See of Quebec, in British America. He was a *protégé* of Dr. Troy, Bishop of Dublin, and from his record on the Detroit frontier it is evident his mission was even more political than religious. He was so overzealous for English control that he became quite unpopular; so much so that he feared his life was in danger. When the American troops took possession of Detroit Father Burke retired to Canada, and subsequently became Bishop of Nova Scotia. His British tendencies were his worst failing. Dr. Shea says "he was an able theologian and controversialist and a good engineer." The spiritual rule over the vast regions of the Northwest Territory was assumed by Bishop Carroll in 1796. The Sulpitian Father Michael Levadoux was sent to Detroit to assume control of the parish of Ste. Anne, whose territory extended from the head waters of Lake Erie to the shores of Lake Superior, including the islands and littoral of Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Father Levadoux retired to France in 1798 and was succeeded by the Sulpitian Father Gabriel Richard. Here, in fact, commences the history of the Catholic Church in Detroit under the American hierarchy, inaugurated as it was by one of the most distinguished of the ecclesiastics which the French Revolution had sent as exiles to the American Republic.

To return to the Recollet pastors of Ste. Anne's of Detroit, who during the greater part of the eighteenth century were the spiritual mentors of the habitants of the north littoral of the strait. From the saintly Father De Lhalle, who first offered the Holy Sacrifice in 1701, the first in the illustrious line of brown-robed friars, down to Father Le Bocquet in 1781, there cannot be found the slightest shadow upon their record.

But the effect of their example and the thoroughness of their pastoral work is made evident in the history of Ste. Anne during the first decade of the pastorate of the Sulpitian Father Richard under the American hierarchy.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

# THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

## Part I.

IN a letter remarkable for the pastoral solicitude and tender charity towards "all the churches" which mark the present occupant of the Papal throne, Leo XIII. recently addressed the Hierarchy of Scotland on the subject of the re-union of Christendom, with more particular regard to "our separated brethren" in Scotland. After alluding to the seeds of Christianity sown by St. Ninian—sent from Rome 200 years before Augustine came to England—watered by St. Columba and other holy missionaries, and fostered by the saintly Queen Margaret, the Pope reminds Scotsmen of the advantages bestowed upon their land by the Catholic Church when she reigned supreme there. It is proposed in this paper to take a glance at some of these advantages, in order to show the loss which Scotland sustained, over and above the loss of the true Faith, in what Leo XIII. terms "the terrible storm which swept over the Church in the sixteenth century."

Anything like an adequate review of the thousand and more years during which Catholicity grew and flourished in Scotland would be an evident impossibility in an article such as this. It would therefore seem more to the point to take our stand at the period which was the apogee of its external greatness and power —the early part of the sixteenth century—and thence view in detail the benefits bestowed by the Church upon the nation at large. It was a time when the power and prestige of the Church were most conspicuous; since, although heresy had dared now and again to rear its head, it was scarcely regarded yet as an enemy to be feared.

Glancing from our standpoint down the vista of past ages, we come in sight of many a saintly figure. Faithful Ireland had sent her missionaries—Columba, Drostan, Brendan, and a host of others, to evangelize the land. Scotland herself gave birth to others—Serf, Mungo, Ternan, Blaan, Nathalan, Duthac—to carry on the holy work. The blood of national martyrs—of Donnan and his companion monks, of Maelrubha and Adrian and Magnus—watered the soil; thousands more, the secret of whose sanctity is known only to Heaven, pleaded for the country, and enriched it with streams of grace. Through their prayers and

merits religion has flourished, and the Church has grown up to be a mighty tree, whose branches overshadow the land.

At the period we are considering, the Catholic Church energises through thirteen episcopal sees. Stately cathedrals, monasteries, collegiate and parish churches stud the realm. God is worshipped within them with a magnificence of ceremonial not fully realized, and scarcely appreciated, in a nineteenth century, when ritual is often bound to give place to practical utility. Prelates, distinguished not only for wisdom and holiness, but often by noble, and even royal blood, uphold the Church's dignity; in the primatial see alone, no less than six of royal pedigree have occupied the episcopal chair during a century. In Scotland, as everywhere and at all times, the Church has ever been the nursing-mother of learning and science, the patron of the liberal and mechanical arts, the faithful guardian of the rights of her children, defending them against oppression, relieving their hunger with lavish charity, harboring the homeless, cherishing the sick, providing, as far as lay in her power, for all their wants, both spiritual and temporal. It is the attempt of these pages to show in detail how, through all these channels—splendor of fabric and ritual, powerful prelates, learned men, tender and sympathetic lovers of their kind—she was the truest benefactor Scotland ever possessed.

David I., whom Scots love to designate "Saint," though a less generous successor to his throne styled him "a sair sanct for the crown," was the first of a series of pious and enlightened rulers sprung from St. Margaret. To this great King Scotland owed not only a host of monastic foundations—Dunfermline, Kelso, Lesmahago, for Benedictines; Melrose, Newbattle, Dundrennan, Kinloss, for Cistercians; Holyrood and Jedburgh, for Austin Canons; Torphicen, for Knights Hospitallers, and the rest—but she was also indebted to him for the introduction of method and order into the parochial system. His enthusiastic biographer, Aelred, the saintly abbot of Rielvaux, says that David found only three or four dioceses existing and left nine behind him; these further multiplied in succeeding centuries.

To attempt any adequate description of even one of the cathedrals of these dioceses, as they appeared in the sixteenth century, would be vain in so brief a review as this. The primatial see of St. Andrews boasted of a church 358 feet long, with a lofty central spire, numerous decorated pinnacles, and copper roofs blazing in the sun—its interior resplendent with polished pavements, carven images, and costly windows of painted glass. Then there

was Glasgow Cathedral, enshrining in its unrivalled eastern crypt the body of St. Mungo; Aberdeen, with its granite church—the only cathedral in the world built of that material—and its exquisite wood-carving, of finer workmanship than anything of its kind in Europe. To enumerate would be tedious, but at the risk of trying the reader's patience we cannot forbear a more detailed description of Elgin Cathedral—"The Lantern of the North"—which perhaps bore the palm.

It was 282 feet long and 87 wide, and stood on a cruciform ground-plan. Its architecture was in the purest early English style, with later additions in French flamboyant. The great western doorway, under a beautifully carved and moulded arch, was divided by a central pillar to form a double entrance. It was flanked on either side by a massive square tower, each one rising to the height of more than a hundred feet. A fine central tower and spire at the junction of the transepts measured twice that height. Entering the great nave, the visitor beheld, dividing off the choir, the grand Rood screen of carved woodwork, painted and gilded, with its beautiful crucifix above. Beyond were richly carved stalls for the canons. Minute and exquisite carving everywhere abounded; beautifying the pillars, the window-tracery, the numerous lateral chantries, the magnificent octagonal chapter-house. Stained glass filled the windows; that over the western entrance measured 27 feet in height, and a unique cluster of lancet lights in double tier, surmounted by a beautiful wheel-window, filled the entire wall-space at the eastern end of the choir. One of the bishops, speaking two hundred years earlier than the sixteenth century, called it "The special ornament of the land, the glory of the realm, the delight of strangers and foreigners who came to see it, a praise and excellency of praise in foreign countries for the number of its ministers, its sumptuous decoration, its pious worship of God, its lofty bell-towers, its splendid furniture, and countless jewels."[1] What, then, must have been the beauty of this vast building when two centuries of further benefactions had still more enriched its splendors."

But the glorious cathedrals were rivalled and often surpassed by the monastic and conventual churches scattered over the land. Some seventy abbeys and priories of monks and nuns, about a hundred houses of canons and friars, and forty collegiate establishments, presented a varied and beautiful spectacle of architectural display. Dunfermline—the "Durham of the North"—shel-

[1] Letter of Bishop Bar, quoted by Walcott, *Ancient Church of Scot.*, p. 140.

tered under its massive arches the shrine of St. Margaret, its first foundress. Arbroath, its glorious rival, possessed a splendid church of rose-red sandstone, built in the style of Chester and Lichfield cathedrals; it stood on a wind-swept height, overlooking the sea, and its nave and choir stretched to the length of 268 feet, while its roof rose 67 feet above its pavement. Kelso had a church of thirteenth century style, with graceful lofty arches, rich arcadings around its walls, and beautiful windows. Then Melrose was conspicuous for lace-like tracery and delicate carving; Sweetheart—the memorial of Devorgilla's wifely affection and of her husband's heart enshrined within it—had its noble clustered pillars and graceful wheel-windows. Of all these Benedictine and Cistercian churches we will single out one for more minute description.

The Cluniac Benedictine abbey of Paisley, founded in 1164 by Walter Fitz-Alan, High Steward of Scotland, and ancestor of the House of Stuart, was remarkable for the striking beauty of its situation, as well as for the splendid adornments of its buildings. It stood on a level mead near the clear waters of the little river Cart, in view of undulating, wooded slopes and lofty hills. The abbey precincts were enclosed by a wall of dressed stone, upwards of a mile in length. They consisted of spacious gardens and orchards, and even a park for fallow deer. The wall was adorned with carven statues, and shields bearing coats of arms. In a niche was enshrined the image of Our Lady; beneath it was inscribed:

"Hac ne vade via, nisi dixeris Ave Maria.
Sit semper sine væ, qui tibit dicit Ave."[1]

A stately gate-house led to the monastic buildings. The church was entered at the western end by a door set in a fine Early English arch, and at the north through a deep porch, surmounted by a chamber known as a *parvise*. This latter was the ordinary entrance. The porch, we may remark, was a common feature in the mediæval churches. Many parochial rites, such as the commencement of the marriage ceremony and of the baptism of infants, were performed there.

The church measured nearly 220 feet in length. Its graceful pointed arches were supported by clustered pillars, and a richly carved triforium ran over the aisles. The choir was longer than the nave—not an uncommon feature in the Cluniac churches; it

[1] This we have ventured to English:

"Pass not by this way, till you your Ave say.
From woe may he be free, who saith *Ave* to thee."

contained stalls for twenty-six monks; these had been provided by Abbot Tarvas in 1459. The same devout abbot procured the great brass book-stand, the chandeliers of chased silver, and the beautiful tabernacle—"the statliest in al Skotland and the maist costlie"—as well as the rich hangings of cloth of gold and silver to decorate the sanctuary on festival days. In the south transept was an elaborately carved chapel, where the body of St. Mirin, one of the ancient missionaries of the country, lay in a gorgeous shrine, and was an object of devotion to numerous pilgrims. In its external adornments, also, this fine church was very striking. Its central tower and steeple rose to the height of 300 feet. Such was Paisley in its glory—a worthy House of God, in which the daily choral office celebrated His praise.

Other religious orders could boast of buildings no less magnificent than those of the monks. Jedburgh, belonging to the Black Canons, Dryburgh to the White Canons, were gems of architecture. Many of the churches of the friars, too, were famed for their beauty. That of the Observantines at Edinburgh was so magnificent that a foreign friar, Cornelius, could hardly be persuaded to take possession of it, thinking it incompatible with the poverty required by his rule. It needed the intervention of the Pope to settle his scruples. The Franciscan Church at Haddington was known as the "Light of Lothian," from the costly lamps which illuminated its beautiful windows by night. It was in the decorated style, and measured 210 feet in length.

Collegiate and parish churches, also, were often built with great magnificence. The stately church of St. Giles, Edinburgh's glory, escaped almost unscathed—as regards its exterior—the frenzy of fanatical reformers. The almost barbaric splendor of the exquisitely carved Roslin Chapel, near Edinburgh, is proverbial.

Such buildings would have been meaningless had the worship for which they had been erected been wanting in grandeur. That this was not the case is evident from the inventories of vestments and church furniture still extant. Aberdeen Cathedral possessed no less than thirty-six copes, of which ten were of cloth of gold, and others of rich velvet. It had also thirteen full sets of High Mass vestments, and a plentiful supply of hangings and other adornments. Holyrood Abbey could boast of various crosses, candlesticks, censers, cruets, etc., of gold or silver, besides many precious chalices and vestments. The same might doubtless be affirmed of all the great cathedrals and minsters.

With regard to the splendor of the ritual observed within them,

we are able to gain an insight as to its nature by comparing it with the contemporary ceremonial of England and other countries. It may perhaps bring the subject home more closely if we venture to describe in detail the celebration of some solemn feast as a worshipper would see it carried out in Glasgow Cathedral in the sixteenth century. Glasgow is selected as being one of the Scottish cathedrals in which the Sarum Rite was followed. That rite, differing in many details from the Roman, to which Catholics are now accustomed, was introduced at Glasgow by Bishop Herbert in the twelfth century, and was observed there up to the Reformation.

A visitor to St. Mungo's on the eve of the feast in question will await, with the crowd of laity who throng the nave, the entrance of the archbishop and canons. The festal pealing of the bells announces the approach of the prelate, and soon a stately procession sweeps through the great western entrance—only opened for such occasions—and passes up the nave to the jubilant welcome of organ and singers. Twelve officials lead the way. One bears aloft the archiepiscopal cross, the others carry maces of solid silver. Thirty canons in their choir dress of surplice and furred hood surround the archbishop, and a crowd of attendants bring up the rear. The brilliant throng passes through the gates of the choir, the "rulers of choir," or cantors, each robed in silken cope and bearing a silver staff of office, range themselves across the western end, near the beautiful Rood-screen, and the solemn evensong commences.

The canons, seated in their stalls on either side, join in the chanting with the help of the great choral-books bound in white leather, which form part of the church's rich treasury. The altar, decked for the feast, is resplendent with magnificent silken frontal —perhaps that one "powdered with crowns of gold," or that "of red silk with ornamentation of flowers and leaves," which figure in the inventory of this cathedral; above the altar, in the silver pyx which hangs from the carved and gilded canopy of the "Sacrament House" by chains of precious metal, is the Blessed Sacrament, surrounded by ever-burning lights. At the *Magnificat* two priests in copes jointly incense the High Altar; then, passing by opposite aisles down the church, offer the same act of honor to each of the twenty altars of the upper church. Vespers ended, the prelate and his attendants depart in the same stately array with which they came.

But it is at the Pontifical Mass on the morning of the festival that the ceremonial is most impressive. Entering in the same

state as for Vespers, the archbishop and canons, together with the inferior clergy, prepare to take part in the solemn procession with which the rite commences. Soon the spectator sees it issuing from the great gates of the choir. Three clerics, clad in albs and silken tunics and walking abreast, bear aloft three richly chased processional crosses of precious metal. Acolytes, thurifers, attendants follow. Cantors in copes, deacons and subdeacons—five, or even seven of each—vested in tunicles, canons wearing rich copes, follow in due order. The archbishop in his precious mitre and cope, bearing his pastoral staff—his cross borne before him—forms the principal figure in this magnificent assemblage. Passing down the aisle, the procession makes the circuit of the vast church and returns to the choir. After the office of Tierce has been sung the Mass begins. The cantors commence the solemn chant of the *Introit* as the celebrating prelate and his train of assistant ministers enter from the sacristy beyond the choir, clad in their vestments. With stately rhythm the august rite proceeds. Five deacons and as many subdeacons, and on the highest festivals seven of each order, take part in the function. During the Canon of the Mass the sanctuary presents a spectacle of imposing splendor. On the highest step of the altar is the archbishop in his jewelled vestments, below him the long line of deacons, lower still the subdeacons; in the choir are canons in copes and clergy in surplices. It is a scene of magnificence such as the Catholic Church alone can furnish, and one which might be witnessed in many a cathedral of Scotland in Catholic ages.

The ceremonies of the Church, imposing as they were in themselves, were rendered doubly so by the assistance of kings and nobles with their vast trains of attendants. The power and authority of the Church was all the more impressed upon the minds of the faithful when the great ones of the earth, in common with the lowliest, had to bend the knee before the King of Kings. It was the delight of James IV. to assist at the canonical office in the choir of St. Mungo's, where he was privileged to occupy a stall as honorary canon. Edward I. of England, when staying in Glasgow, made more than one devout visit to the shrine of St. Mungo, in the beautiful under-croft of the cathedral. Edward III. spent at Melrose the Christmas festival of 1340, and assisted at the solemn offices celebrated by the monks. Many more examples may be found in history.

The splendor with which monarchs took part in religious celebrations may be imagined from the descriptions extant of the progress of James IV. on one of his numerous pilgrimages to the

Shrine of St. Ninian in Galloway. When proceeding in state, with his queen, to offer thanks for the latter's delivery from the danger of death at the birth of her first child, the retinue was most imposing. The queen travelled in a sumptuous litter. Seventeen carriage-horses were employed to convey her wardrobe and effects, and four more for those of the King. It may be remarked, in passing, that James made no less than fourteen pilgrimages to the same shrine between the years 1501 and 1512. He also made pilgrimages to the Isle of May and to St. Duthac's shrine at Tain in Ross-shire.

But it was not as worshippers merely that kings and nobles proclaimed themselves humble sons of the Church. They loved to minister to her needs out of their worldly substance. Hence, such scanty records of the Religious Houses as survived the downfall of Religion give many instances of their generous benefactors. The munificence of King David I. has been already mentioned. Other monarchs were not slow in following his example in establishing foundations. William the Lion, Malcolm IV., Alexander II., Alexander III., Robert the Bruce, are conspicuous benefactors of the kind. Alexander II. was a munificent founder of monasteries for Dominicans, who owed to this liberal donor no less than eight of their houses—those of Edinburgh, Berwick, Ayr, Perth, Aberdeen, Elgin, Stirling and Inverness. Nobles imitated their sovereigns. Dryburgh Abbey was founded in 1141 by Hugh de Morville, Constable of Scotland; Crossraguel by Duncan, Earl of Carrick, in the twelfth century; Paisley, as we have seen, by Fitz-Alan, and so with others. Benefactions continued to flow into the treasuries of Religious Houses from such sources all through their history, until, in the sixteenth century—our standpoint—the Abbey of Abroath could boast of an annual rental equivalent to $50,000 (£10,000) of our money.

We may have given, some may think, undue prominence to the external splendor of fabric and ceremonial and the *éclat* which resulted from the subserviency of kings and powerful nobles; but it is well to bear in mind that man's soul is reached through the senses, and that all this grandeur of form and beauty of worship were important factors in raising his thoughts to higher things than this present world, and keeping them in mind of the Supreme Being to whose honor it all tended. No Catholic will maintain that Scotland was benefited, either spiritually or æsthetically, by the wholesale hewing down of churches, battering of images and carvings, burning of vestments and stamping out of ritual.

Yet the Church of Scotland in the sixteenth century has something else to boast of beyond buildings and ritual. All through the ages she had been the generous patron of letters. Looking back to preceding centuries, the reader of history is struck by the fact that in Scotland, as in most of the countries of Europe, learning was the exclusive privilege of the clergy. Among a rude and warlike people this was only to be expected. When the bulk of the population have to be ready to take up arms at almost any moment, who but the clergy are capable of fostering the arts of peace? That this was eminently the case in Scotland, her historians testify. "During the long period," says one of them, "from the accession of Alexander III. to the death of David II. (1249–1370) it would be impossible, I believe, to produce a single instance of a Scottish baron who could sign his own name. The studies which formed the learning of the times were esteemed unworthy of the warlike and chivalrous spirit of the aristocracy and universally abandoned to the Church."[1]

If we glance at the list of men distinguished for any branch of learning in the earlier period of Scottish history, it will be evident that although the laity, as yet, despised letters, the clergy held them in high esteem then, even as they did in later ages. To begin with the twelfth century, Godrich, Bishop of St. Andrews, was an author of some note in his day. He wrote, among other works, "Meditations on the Psalter" and "Hymni de Sanctis." Another renowned scholar was David Scotus, a professor in the Scots monastery of Würzburg and historiographer to the Emperor Henry V. He wrote the "Iter Imperatoris," "De Regno Scotorum," etc. Adam, a Premonstratensian Canon, who left Scotland for a French monastery of his order, was another writer of the same period. One still more distinguished than those mentioned above was Richard of St. Victor, a native of Scotland, who became an inmate of the monastery of St. Victor, at Paris. John *a Sacro Bosco*, a Canon Regular of the monastery of Holywood, near Dumfries, was a distinguished scholar at the University of Paris at this period, and became professor of mathematics there. His writings were still in repute three centuries later.

In the following century Scotland could boast of Hugo Bentham, Bishop of Aberdeen (1272), who was renowned for his knowledge of canon law. In the same century we meet the name of Simon Taylor, a Scottish Dominican, who studied at

[1] Fraser Tytler: *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., chap. vi. (append., sec. 5).

Paris and afterwards returned to his native land, where he effected an important reform in Church music. Another noted Scot who flourished in the thirteenth century was the famous Duns Scotus, the *Doctor Subtilis* of the Franciscan Order. His favorite pupil, John Bassoll, another Scottish member of the same order, became professor of philosophy at Paris, and afterwards studied theology and medicine at Rheims. Arnold Blair, a Benedictine monk of Dunfermline, who had studied at Paris, flourished at the end of the century. He was distinguished as a scholar, and wrote a life of Wallace, whom he served as chaplain.

The first Scottish historian, John Fordun, belongs to the next century. He was probably a chantry priest of Aberdeen, but scarcely anything is known of him beyond the fact that he was a Scottish ecclesiastic. His "Scotichronicon" was continued up to the middle of the fifteenth century by Walter Bower, the learned Abbot of Inchcolm, a House of Regular Canons. Contemporary with Fordun was Andrew Wyntoun, Prior of St. Serf's Monastery, Lochleven. He wrote a metrical chronicle of Scotland, concerning which Tytler, the historian, remarks: "Where is the student who is an enthusiast in the history and antiquities of his country who would not rather read the quaint and homely descriptions of the Prior of Lochleven than the pages of modern writers, where vigor, freshness and originality are so often sacrificed to insipid elegance?" In the same fourteenth century flourished the Scottish poet, John Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, who wrote a graphic and spirited poem describing the life and actions of the Bruce. "It is in every respect," says Tytler, "a remarkable production for so early an age as the middle of the fourteenth century, and contains many passages which, in the strength and purity of the language, in the measured fulness of the rhythm, and the richness of the imagery, are not inferior to Chaucer."[1]

When we come to the beginning of the sixteenth century we find the roll of learned ecclesiastics considerably increased. Hector Boece, the well-known historian, a priest of learning and scholarship, studied at Paris, and became the close friend of Erasmus. He was the first Principal of Aberdeen University. His brother, Arthur, was also a distinguished scholar, and possessed remarkable eloquence; he became a canon of Aberdeen. John Bellenden, Archdeacon of Moray, translated Boece's history from the Latin. He was also the author of a translation of Livy. John

[1] *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., append. to chap. vi., sec. 5.

Major, at one time Vicar of Dunlop, Ayrshire, was another famous writer of the period; he became principal of St. Andrews. Florence Wilson, another Scottish priest who became an accomplished scholar, was a native of Elgin. He wrote, among other philosophical works, "Dialogues on Tranquillity of Mind." The works of this writer are remarkable for profound learning and grace of style. Gavin Douglas, the witty and learned Bishop of Dunkeld, besides composing many poetical works, was the first to translate Virgil into English. Dunbar, a native of Lothian, and priest of the diocese of St. Andrews, was also held in high esteem as a poet. "The genius of Dunbar and Gavin Douglas," says Sir Walter Scott, "is sufficient to illuminate whole centuries of ignorance." This list does not pretend to be exhaustive, but it is sufficient to show that Scotland was not behind her contemporaries in producing remarkable scholars; those scholars being found, almost without exception, amongst the clergy.

But it would be a mistake to imagine that the Church made no effort to promote learning in the laity. "In almost all the periods of the history of Scotland," says an historian, "whatever documents deal with the social condition of the country reveal a machinery for education always abundant, when compared with any traces of art or the other elements of civilization."[1] It is true that no accurate statistics are to be found on the subject, but references to it constantly occur in the cartularies of many of the great monasteries. Perth and Stirling, in 1173, possessed public schools under the direction of the monks of Dunfermline. In 1224 the monks of Lindores were empowered to plant schools in Dundee. The monks of Kelso in 1241, as their cartulary shows, conducted the school of Roxburgh. Similar establishments existed at Ayr, South Berwick and Aberdeen. The noted schools of Haddington were under the patronage of the Abbot of Holyrood.

Besides these external schools, nearly all the important monasteries had one within their own walls. These, though primarily intended for the education of boys aspiring to the monastic state, seem to have been frequented by secular students also. An instance of this is to be seen in the cartulary of Kelso. Matilda, the Lady of Molle, resigned part of her dowry lands in 1260, to provide a certain rent to be paid to the abbot and monks of that abbey on condition that her son should be maintained and educated there amongst their scholars of highest rank.[2] A school was attached

---

[1] Burton, *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. iv., p. 107.

[2] *Liber de Calchon*, vol. i., p. 142.

to the Priory of St. Andrews also, and youths were received there to be instructed in philosophy. The same good offices towards education were rendered in later ages by some of the friars. The school of the Dominicans in Aberdeen was renowned in the sixteenth century, as also that of the Franciscans of Edinburgh. The canons of St. Antony at Leith had a school also.

A proof of the Church's zeal in promoting education is to be found in the Act of Parliament, passed in 1496 at the instance of the clergy, enforcing compulsory education. The statute provided that all barons and freeholders should be compelled under a penalty of twenty pounds to send their sons to school at the age of eight or nine, and allow them to remain there till they had acquired a competent knowledge of Latin. They were afterwards to attend higher schools of art and law, that they might qualify themselves to become sheriffs and judges.[1]

But the opportunities provided for primary education did not satisfy the aspiring youths who wished to pursue the higher studies. Previous to the fifteenth century this desire compelled them to seek an education in England or in continental universities. A large number went to Oxford, where the Lady Devorgilla, mother of the vassal-king, Baliol, had founded in 1282 the college which still bears his name, in memory of her husband, John de Baliol. They seem to have been somewhat unpopular there on account of their adherence to the opposite party during the papal schism—in which Scotland sided with France. It became necessary for Richard II. to write to the University authorities in 1382, forbidding the molestation of the Scots, notwithstanding their "damnable adherence" to the anti-Pope. Great numbers of Scottish students went to Cologne, where the registers show that they outnumbered any other foreign students, and that the greater part of them belonged to the diocese of St. Andrews. Paris also, from the high reputation enjoyed by its schools, and from the sympathy always existing during the middle ages between France and Scotland, had many such students. It was to benefit such that David, Bishop of Moray, founded certain burses in the University of Paris for Scottish youths in the fourteenth century. This liberality may be regarded as the first beginning of the Scots' College in that city.

It was to obviate the necessity of students seeking an education outside the realm that universities were at length erected in Scotland. This, the highest benefit conferred upon education, was the

[1] *Acts of Parl. of Scot.*, vol. ii., p. 238.

work of the Church, as Protestant historians testify. "It may with truth be said," remarks Burton, "that in the history of human things there is to be found no grander conception than that of the Church of the fifteenth century, when it resolved, in the shape of universities, to cast the light of knowledge abroad over the Christian world."[1] "The universities of Scotland," says Cosmo Innes, "are the legitimate offspring of the Church. They alone, of our existing institutions, carry us back to the time when the clergy were the only supporters of schools, and the bishop of the great diocese was the patron and head, as well as the founder, of its university."[2]

St. Andrews was the first to lead the way. Bishop Wardlaw, who had completed his own studies at Oxford, founded a university in his cathedral city, with the concurrence of the prior and canons of his chapter, in the year 1410. Bishop Kennedy, in 1444, founded in connection with it the College of St. Salvator, and Archbishop Alexander Stuart that of St. Leonard's in the following century. These colleges received the approbation of Popes Paul II., Nicholas V., Pius II., and other sovereign pontiffs.

The second Scottish university owed its existence to Bishop Turnbull, who petitioned Pope Nicholas V. for leave to found one in his episcopal city of Glasgow. This Pope, whom Macaulay has styled "the greatest of the restorers of learning," gladly approved of the project, and erected the University of Glasgow by a papal bull in 1450. The office of Chancellor was always to be held by a Bishop of Glasgow, and the new foundation received from the Pope the same privileges for professors and students as were enjoyed by the papal university of Bologna.

At the close of the same century, another great ecclesiastic founded the third Scottish university in his cathedral city; this was the learned and holy Bishop Elphinstone, of Aberdeen. The papal constitution which erected it bestowed upon it the usual privileges, and nominated the bishop of the diocese as *ex officio* Chancellor.

Edinburgh University is not strictly speaking a Catholic foundation, and scarcely falls within the scope of our subject; yet a passing allusion must be made to it, as there, also, it was an ecclesiastic who gave the impetus to its erection. Bishop Reid, of Orkney, who died in 1553, left by his will certain sums of money for the education of the sons of poor gentlemen at the Scottish

---

[1] *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. iv., p. 109.

[2] *Sketches of Early Scotch Hist.*, p. 220.

universities. He bequeathed at the same time 8000 merks for the foundation of a college in Edinburgh; this bequest resulted in the erection of the university of that city after the Reformation. In all these ways had the Church been the protector and fosterer of learning, and the sixteenth century was reaping the benefits which had been so lavishly bestowed during the preceding ages.

If we turn from the realm of science to that of the arts, we find the Church still cherishing everything that could in any way benefit her children. Taylor, the Dominican, the renowned musician of the thirteenth century, has already had a passing notice. The influence of his writings, "De cantu ecclesiastico corrigendo," "De tenore musicali," etc., was so great that he is said to have raised the standard of church music in Scotland to equal that of Rome. A more methodical cultivation of the art of singing was the result; for not long after his time the custom obtained of establishing schools for the express purpose of training boys to sing in the church services. About the middle of the thirteenth century the statutes of Aberdeen provided for "singing boys" to assist in the cathedral choir on great festivals. In the course of a century a definite institution, known as the "sang school," was established for the training of such choristers. An instructor was appointed, who bound himself to remain all his life in the burgh, "singing, keeping and upholding mass, matins, evensongs, completories, psalms, responses, antiphonies and hymns in the church on festival days," his salary being fixed at twenty-four merks per annum. The master of the "sang school" was also required "to instruct burgesses' sons in singing and playing on the organ, for the upholding of God's service in the choir, they paying him his scholage and dues." At Brechin, in like manner, as the Episcopal Register testifies, a "sang school" was endowed by the Earl of Athole, and a chaplain appointed to conduct it. The foundation of such institutions became frequent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and continued after the Reformation, until all the more important towns could boast of one. Many of these, though their later purpose was to minister to the psalm-singing of Presbyterian conventicles, were the product of Catholic piety and generosity in a former age.[1]

For the cultivation of the rest of the fine arts, Scotland is just as much indebted to the Church. The monasteries were at first the only refuge of the artist. In their quiet scriptorium the monks of Kelso, for example, labored patiently at the far-famed miniatures

[1] *Vide* Edgar, *Hist. of Early Scott. Educ.*, pp. 99 *et seq.*

of their illuminated manuscripts, and to such hidden workers the country owed the development of an early taste for painting. The charter of Malcolm IV. to that abbey, a truly magnificent specimen of early art in illuminating and miniature painting, is still preserved at Floors Castle. The monks of Kelso have been chosen in illustration of this subject because it was an important principle in the rule of the Tiron branch of the Benedictine Order —to which they belonged—that each monk should learn and practice some useful art. Hence the Tiron monks became famous for their skill in painting, metal work, carving, sculpture and glass-staining, and also for their practical knowledge of many less exalted but no less necessary arts, as the sequel will show.

The principle which Bernard of Ponthieu, when he founded his abbey of Tiron, thought so important, was to a certain extent held by all cloistered monks. St. Benedict in his Rule, specially inculcates the carrying out in the spirit of humility of any art or craft which a monk may have already learned to practice. The proficiency of many of the early monks is explained by the above principles. Not only did they embellish the structures of their beautiful churches, but there is good reason to suppose that they were themselves in most cases the architects. It is a remarkable fact, and it bears out this conjecture, that the names of the first designers of those glorious buildings have been left in oblivion.

Painting, sculpture, glass-staining and carving, which the monks cherished so faithfully and made use of for the beautifying of their churches, fostered a love of art in those who beheld the results of their genius and labors. Not only did prelates call in the aid of painter, sculptor and carver for the beautifying of their cathedrals and churches, but kings and nobles took a delight in providing such embellishments for the House of God, and, later on, for their own palaces and castles also.

A splendid specimen of painting still remains in the little church of Fowlis Easter, near Dundee, which will serve as an illustration of this. It consists of a series of pictures painted on the screen which separates the nave from the sanctuary. They represent the crucifixion with attendant figures, pictures of the apostles, and other subjects. The style of the work indicates the middle of the fifteenth century as the date of its execution. There is good reason for supposing that the whole surface of the walls of this little church bore similar decorations, but that they were effaced at the Reformation by the tearing down of the wall plaster. The panels of the screen were coated thickly with whitewash at the same period, and to this fact the preservation of the pictures is

due. They were discovered about the middle of the present century. The artist is conjectured to have belonged to the Flemish school. The presence of paintings of such superior excellence in a little village church testifies to the high state of culture in Scotland in the agé which produced them.

Another instance of the appreciation of the painter's art is seen in the employment for three years of a foreign painter, Andrew Bairhum, by Abbot Reid of Kinloss, for the decoration of his abbey church. Traces of these frescoes of the sixteenth century may still be descried amid the ruins of Kinloss. The faint remains of mural paintings under the chancel arch and on the wall of a chapel at Pluscardyn Priory, near Elgin, which seem to have been executed at about the same period, may also be mentioned as a passing illustration of the same subject.

James IV. lavished his means on the decoration of his royal palaces and of the Chapel Royal at Stirling in a way which led to the imitation of his nobles, in his own and the following reigns. His son, James V., inherited these artistic tastes. His palace at Stirling became a marvel of art for that period, and ranked as one of the wonders of the kingdom.

Allusion has been already made to the diligence of monks in writing and illuminating manuscripts. The mere mention will suggest the conclusion that the country was entirely indebted to the Church for such books as were to be found in those early ages. The Sacred Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and even the classic poets and historians, were copied and recopied with painstaking labor by those indefatigable workers. Monks and clerics were for many ages the only scribes, and have been at all times almost the only writers who possessed the patience necessary for transcription. But the Church was to do more for Scotland than cause manuscripts to be written for such as chose to acquire them. The inestimable treasure of the printing-press may be attributed to her influence also. Under the patronage of Bishop Elphinstone of Aberdeen, Walter Chepman established the first press at Edinburgh about 1509, and almost the first work —if not the very first—executed by it was the "Breviary of Aberdeen," which that prelate had just compiled.

This portion of our subject may be fittingly concluded with a quotation from a Scottish historian, which sums up in a few words what has been set forth in some detail. "The churchmen of those remote times," says Tytler, and he is speaking of the middle ages, "did not only monopolize all the learning which then existed; they were the great masters in the necessary and orna-

mental arts; not only the historians and the poets, but the painters, the sculptors, the mechanics, and even the jewellers, goldsmiths, and lapidaries of the times. From their proficiency in mathematical and mechanical philosophy they were in an especial manner the architects of the age; and the royal and baronial castles, with the cathedrals, monasteries and conventual houses throughout Scotland, were principally the work of ecclesiastics."[1]

It would be leaving the subject incomplete to omit all mention of the way in which the Church had benefited the nation at large in the early centuries by cherishing and promoting the less ornamental, but no less valuable, arts of agriculture and gardening, mining, salt-making, and the like, together with the impetus she gave to commerce and navigation. At a period when laymen might at any moment be called to war, the clergy—especially the monks—were practically the only tillers of the soil, since they alone could count with any degree of certainty on escaping the harrying and wasting of lands by the invader, sheltered as they were under the Church's protection. The vast possessions which had accrued to the monasteries during centuries of benefactions were administered in a way which excites the admiration of even Protestant historians. They repaid the liberality of their benefactors "by becoming," as Tytler says, "the great agricultural improvers of the country." In later ages they became landlords by the leasing out of portions of their property, and their own good example in the scientific management of their farms and estates was a practical lesson to their tenants. The historian quoted above tells us that in the fourteenth century, while the diet of the upper classes consisted of wheaten bread, beef, mutton, bacon, venison and game of all descriptions, and that in the greatest profusion, the lower orders, "who could look to a certain supply of pork and eggs, cheese, butter, ale and oaten cakes were undoubtedly, so far as respects these comforts, in a prosperous condition."[2]

Besides the cultivation of the land, the monks paid attention to gardening also. The Abbey of Lindores, for example, was renowned for its fruit trees. Not the least of the benefits bestowed upon the country by its monks was the importation of new kinds of apple and pear trees from France. The result is seen to the present day in the many fine specimens of fruit trees which grace the gardens and orchards in the vicinity of the ruins of that once

[1] *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., append. to chap. vi., sec. 5. [2] *Ibid.*, sec. 1.

famous abbey. These trees claim descent from the old monastic stock, and some of the original trees planted by the monks still survive in the ruined enclosure of the abbey. The same enterprising gardeners are said to have successfully cultivated the vine. The old chestnut trees introduced by the Austin Canons are still flourishing around the ruins of their old monastery of Inchmahome, and the apple trees of Beauly and walnut trees of Pluscardyn still survive. Recent investigations have brought to light the fact that these monastic gardeners proceeded on thorough scientific principles; some of the trees they planted are found to have been placed upon a basis of stone slabs in the most approved modern manner of fruit cultivation. It is a fact not generally known that the common daffodil or "Lent Lily" (*Narcissus pseudo-narcissus*), which is found growing wild in some parts of Scotland, is limited to those districts which formed part of the property of some monastic establishment. This seems to indicate the introduction and cultivation of the flower by the inmates of such houses for the purpose which its popular name suggests—the decoration of the altar for the Easter festival, owing to its appearance in early spring.

An important branch of the national wealth of Scotland lay in the fisheries. In this, too, the monks led the way; by their skill and enterprise they set an example to lay-folk, and taught them how valuable a source of wealth and comfort lay in the rivers and lakes of the country, and in the seas that surrounded it. The fisheries attached to the great monasteries formed a very valuable portion of their possessions, and are often mentioned in their cartularies.

The monks of Newbattle Abbey were among the first, and probably the very first coal-miners in Scotland, as their charters testify. From those charters the earliest information in reference to the country on the subject of coal is to be obtained. The same monks, as well as those of other abbeys, had extensive salt-pans—another branch of industry for which the country is indebted to their zeal and activity.

"In naval and commercial enterprise," says Tytler, "as in all the other arts and employments which contributed to increase the comforts and the luxuries of life, the clergy appear to have led the way. They were the greatest ship-owners in the country." He goes on to relate that they were the great exporters of wool, skins, hides and salted fish, as well as a large quantity of live stock—as horses, cattle and sheep.[1] As the towns had sprung

[1] *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., append. to chap. vi., sec. 4.

up in many cases around the larger monasteries, the markets and fairs were often under the control of the monks; this was another means by which they taught their contemporaries the value of agricultural industry, and benefited both them and their posterity.

We come now to the care which the Church manifested for the poor and suffering; for it is in this that her bounty appeals most strongly to the appreciation of men. She has never been wanting in any age in means whereby to succor those in need. All through the middle ages the monasteries had been the recognized support of the poor. The "Almonry Gate" at Dunfermline, where food was daily dispensed, still remains. Seven chalders of meal were distributed to the needy every week at the Abbey of Paisley. But a still more striking example is seen in the charity of Melrose Abbey. On one occasion, when famine had devastated the country, the starving people from far and near fled to the monks to crave food, and in a truly princely way was their confidence rewarded. No less than four thousand of them, dwelling in rude huts which they had hastily erected on the hillsides and in the woods round about, were daily fed by the loving charity of the monks for three months, and thus saved from starvation till the corn was ripe for the sickle. The same generous monastery had a hospital for the sick poor in the twelfth century. These are only instances taken at random from history, but they serve to show that the abundant riches of the monasteries were regarded as—what they truly were—the patrimony of the poor.

In what may be styled the monastic age of Scotland, the poor turned naturally to the monastery in all their needs. Like other branches of learning, that of medicine also was monopolized by the monks; they were the physicians of the time. At a later age the charity of prelates and nobles and of the faithful of less exalted rank, showed itself in the foundation and sustentation of hospitals for the sick and poor. Such were those charitable institutions known by the beautiful title of *Maison Dieu* at Elgin, Brechin, Old Roxburgh and other towns; such the Hospital of St. Nicholas at Glasgow, founded in 1470 by Bishop Muirland, in which women ministered as nurses. Then there were the "Lazar Houses" for more loathsome or infectious diseases, taking their name from the Lazarus of the parable who lay at the rich man's gate full of sores; many such were scattered over the country, as at Aberdeen, Ligerswood in Lauderdale, Lerwick in far-off Shetland, etc. More touching still is the tender sympathy which prompted the establishment of Leper-hospitals at Aberdeen, Glasgow, Old Cambus, Papastour in Shetland, and other places.

It is impossible to refrain from pointing out here that, although these and numerous other hospitals for the sick poor existed from their foundation up to the change of religion, their revenues were too great a temptation to the "Reformers"; they were consequently swept away, together with the Church. Nor were they speedily replaced. "The Ancient Church," says Chambers, "was honorably distinguished by its charity towards the poor, and more especially towards the diseased poor; and it was a dreary interval of nearly two centuries which intervened between the extinction of its lazar-houses and leper-houses, and the time when merely a civilized humanity dictated the establishment of a regulated means of succor for the sickness-stricken of the humbler classes."[1]

But the Church, always keenly sympathetic with suffering or want of any kind, did not delay her charity till sickness came to harass the poor. Numerous hospitals, as they also were called, existed in Scotland, as in other countries, which were designed to serve as homes for the aged, infirm, or destitute. Thus, Robert Ballantyne, Abbot of Holyrood, founded in the fifteenth century his hospital, near Edinburgh, for seven poor folk. Sir James Douglas had already erected at Dalkeith, in 1396, a refuge for six poor men. Bishop Spens, of Aberdeen, founded at Edinburgh, in 1479, St. Mary's Hospital for twelve almsmen. Robert Spital, tailor to James IV., founded at Stirling an asylum for decayed merchants and tradesmen. Soltre, a town 17 miles distant from Edinburgh, possessed a hospital for pilgrims, travellers and poor folk, with which Malcolm IV. had endowed it in 1164. Turriff, in Aberdeenshire, was gifted by Alexander Comyn, Earl of Buchan, with the collegiate establishment known as "St. Congan's Hospital"; it consisted of a master and six chaplains. To this was attached an asylum for thirteen poor husbandmen. At Banff was a *bede-house* for eight aged women.

To enumerate further would only weary the reader. Suffice it to say that the sixteenth century possessed nearly eighty of such institutions in Scotland for the benefit of the poor. It is needless to remark that they were carried on in a far different spirit from that which reigns in our nineteenth century poor-houses.

We may have seemed to wander continually from the period which it was proposed to illustrate, but the digressions have always been made with a purpose in view. It would have been impossible to present to the reader any accurate picture of the Church of the sixteenth century, of the power with which she reigned in

[1] Chambers, *Domestic Animals*, vol. iii., p. 557.

Scotland, and the benefits the nation owed to her, without frequent excursions into earlier ages. For it must be borne in mind that whatever the sixteenth century possessed—learning and science in all their branches, splendid buildings, ornate ceremonial worship, institutions for the benefit of humanity—all these were but the product of earlier centuries, during which the Catholic religion and churchmen held undisputed sway.

One more point remains to be touched upon. Allusion has already been made to some of the chief men of learning produced by the Scottish Church up to the early part of the century we are considering. Some few others, whose names have not yet been mentioned, or if so, only in passing, must now be brought forward to illustrate another class of those who devoted themselves to their country's welfare. Ecclesiastics, since they were practically the only men who could be styled "learned," had always held a prominent place in the affairs of state from a very early period of history. The office of Lord Chancellor—the confidential adviser, the "keeper of the king's conscience," as he was often styled—was in Catholic ages always a prelate. From the end of the twelfth to the first quarter of the sixteenth century no less than ten of the primates held that office, while Aberdeen furnished three, Brechin three, and Dunkeld six. Other offices of state of less ecclesiastical character were also constantly filled by churchmen. Thus, as Lord Chamberlain, we find Bishops of St. Andrews mentioned in 1238 and 1328, Bishops of Dunkeld in 1250 and 1376, and others at various times. The office of Lord Privy Seal was filled from time to time by Bishops of Aberdeen, Brechin, Moray and other prelates. But the most striking proof of the superior efficiency of churchmen in offices of state is seen in the appointments of Lord High Treasurer—an office which would seem to have little in common with their clerical profession. In the latter half of the fifteenth and early part of the sixteenth century we find enumerated as having filled this important post, the Bishops of Glasgow, Dunkeld, the Isles and Caithness, the Abbots of Paisley, Dunfermline, Melrose, Arbroath, Holyrood, Cambuskenneth, and the Deans of Glasgow and Moray, with many other dignified ecclesiastics.

Among these great statesmen the name of William Elphinstone illuminates the commencement of the sixteenth century—"a name," says Innes, "to be reverenced above every other in the latter days of the ancient Scottish Church."[1] He was born at

[1] Cosmo Innes: *Sketches of Early Scotch Hist.*, p. 260.

Glasgow about the year 1431. In his twenty-sixth year he became a priest, and afterwards studied at Paris and Orleans. In 1474 he was made Rector of Glasgow University. In 1482 he became Bishop of Ross, and in the following year was translated to Aberdeen. He declined the primacy, which was offered to him in 1513, and died in the following year. Bishop Elphinstone was employed in embassies to France, England, Burgundy and Austria. He was Chancellor to James III. and Lord Privy Seal to James IV. His private life was irreproachable; he was assiduous in the study of the Holy Scriptures and of the Fathers and constant in his charity to the poor. He did much to beautify his cathedral at Aberdeen; to his bounty it owed the great central tower with its fourteen fine bells. He also benefited the town by building the great bridge over the Dee.

Another prominent figure during this period was Gavin Dunbar, who, after being Prior of Whitherne, became eventually Archbishop of Glasgow in 1523. He was tutor to James V., and afterwards Lord Chancellor.

Another Gavin Dunbar was Bishop of Aberdeen in 1519, after being Archdeacon of St. Andrews. He was Clerk of the Council in 1503, and afterwards held the office of Master of the Rolls. He founded a hospital for twelve bedesmen at Aberdeen.

Bishop Hepburn, of Moray, who had previously been Abbot of Dunfermline, held the office of Lord High Treasurer. He died in 1524.

A noted politician of this period was Gavin Douglas, the poet, who became, in 1516, Bishop of Dunkeld. At one time he seemed destined for the primacy at the death of Archbishop Stuart, in 1513; but it was eventually bestowed upon the Bishop of Moray, Andrew Foreman. Though a learned churchman, it was said of Gavin Douglas that he had the ascendancy of the House of Douglas more at heart than either the good of his diocese or the welfare of his country. He died in 1522.

The prelate who was eventually appointed to St. Andrews at this period was Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray. His energy and ability rank him high among the Scottish bishops of his time. He had a short but vigorous episcopate, being the author of many measures calculated to improve the discipline of the Church. On his death, in 1521, he was succeeded as primate by James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow. It was during the rule of this prelate that an ecclesiastic came into prominence who was destined to play a foremost part in the occurrences of that stormy period of Scottish history. This was the Archbishop's nephew,

David Beaton, who, after some years of residence abroad, returned to Scotland in 1525, and in 1528 was made Lord Privy Seal. His connection with the Reformation period must be deferred to a future article.

Such was the Scottish Church during the first quarter of the sixteenth century as exhibited in her glorious buildings and consecrated traditions and in the illustrious prelates and statesmen she had produced. Her life and honor seemed bound up with the welfare of her children, and she was enshrined in their hearts as a divine power in the land. Looking at the Church from without, it would seem impossible that she should ever be cast down from her high estate. The letter written to Pope Clement VII. by James V., on January 21, 1526, shows that this was the feeling in Scotland. He assured the Pope that the interests of religion were safe in his hands, not only against Lutheranism, but against every other form of heresy.

And yet in less than forty years the Catholic faith had been proscribed by law. The truth is that the causes of its downfall were already working—hidden under the glory which seemed so imperishable. That this was so we shall endeavor to show in a future article.

Dom. Michael Barrett, O.S.B.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort Augustus, Scotland.

## FREEMASONRY IN LATIN AMERICA.

THE first Masonic Lodge in Spain was established in 1726; the first Lodge in Madrid was opened in 1731. Not having been condemned by the Church until 1738, the Brethren of the Three Points enjoyed twelve years of perfect freedom for the diffusion of their poison ere its deadly nature was perceived by the Spaniards. Lodges were soon founded in all the principal cities; and when, in 1756, the government of Ferdinand VI. awoke to a sense of its duty in reference to the sectaries, they had multiplied to such an extent, and their nefarious doctrines had been so widely spread, that very little good was effected by that celebrated prohibitory edict which Masonic apologists affect to stigmatize as "the greatest and most cruel persecution of their order." When Charles III. left Naples in order to mount the Spanish throne in 1759, many of his courtiers were adepts of the Square and Compass; for the Neapolitan court had been a hotbed of Masonry for many years. With the advent of these Italian brethren, the most prominent of whom was the Marquis of Squillace, the Lodge of Madrid found its power greatly increased; and from that day the influence of the sectaries on the policy of the Spanish government has been almost permanent. Much of this success was originally due to the fact that in those days the Spanish Lodges, like those of the Two Sicilies, depended from the Grand Lodge of London, and to the analogous fact that the English cabinet encouraged the propagation of Masonry in both Spain and Portugal for its own political and commercial interests. Keene, the English ambassador at Madrid, devoted most of his energy and time to the Masonic propaganda; and when Charles IV. ascended the throne, nearly all the commerce of Spain was in English hands. Under Charles IV., many of the highest functionaries of the kingdom and not a few ecclesiastics were votaries of the Dark Lantern. Even the Inquisition was invaded by the sectaries. Llorente, the secretary of the dread tribunal, was one of the most active Masons of his day; and to his perversion is due that shallow diatribe which the average Protestant regards as a "History" of the institution which is his most persistent nightmare.[1] The power of the sectaries had become so great in 1800,

[1] For an account of Llorente and his book, see our *Studies in Church History*, vol. ii., p. 402.

that Urquijo, the Prime Minister of Charles IV. and a Mason of high degree, thought that the time had come when Spain might definitely cease to have any relations with Rome, and he issued a series of edicts tending to that end. Fortunately the king hearkened to the representations of Pius VII., and revoked the schismatical decrees; but the Masonic influence was not easily thwarted. Urquijo and his brethren devised a plan for the un-Christianization of their country; he proposed to import several hundred thousands of Russian and other Jews into Spain, and to give them such pecuniary aid and political encouragement that in time they might dominate the Christian element in the kingdom.[1] The French invasions prevented the actuation of this design, and it was already forgotten when, in 1869, after the enforced abdication of Isabella II., the eminent Mason, Zorilla, endeavored to actuate a similar plan. Zorilla proposed to the government of the temporary Regency (Marshal Serrano) that an invitation to settle in Spain should be extended to many thousands of English Protestants. "These immigrants," he insisted, "*must all be English Protestants*"; and unpatriotically ignoring the fact that modern Spain had owed to Irish Catholic immigrants much of the military power that she still possessed, he added: "Spain (*i.e.*, Spanish Freemasonry) *has no use for Irish Catholics.*" In 1880 another luminary of Freemasonry, Sagasta, then Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Spain, and, unfortunately, Prime Minister of Alfonso XII., affected feelings of commiseration for the Russian Jews, against whom the Slavs, maddened by the poverty to which Hebraic usury had reduced them, had risen in wicked riot. The tender-hearted statesman urged Alfonso XII. to pay the travelling expenses of 80,000 of the Russian and Polish Jews if they would settle in Spain, and to give to each head of a family or adult unmarried man a share of the public lands, all necessary implements, etc., and a guarantee of support until they were able to sustain themselves—that is, until the greater part of the lands of their Christian neighbors would have fallen into their clutches.[2] Alfonso XII. declined to promote the Masonico-Jewish project; but, nevertheless, the brethren anticipated much power for their order during the reign of the weak son of Isabella II. In the "Bulletin of the Symbolic Scotch Grand Lodge," Jan., 1882, we read: "In Spain cruel trials have frequently been the portion of Freemasonry; tolerated and proscribed alternately, the lot of the

[1] La Fuente, *Ecclesiastical History of Spain*, vol. iv., p 144. Madrid, 1873.

[2] Deschamps, *Secret Societies and Society*, bk. iii., ch. 6, § i. Sixth edition. Paris, 1882.

Spanish brethren has never been an enviable one. We were a little anxious as to the course that Alfonso XII. would pursue in our regard; but we are satisfied, since his promises to enforce *liberty of conscience* have been fulfilled. The advent of the illustrious Grand Master, Praxedes Mateo Sagasta, to the Prime Ministership, assures to Freemasonry the power of exercising its *mission of benevolence*, and of diffusing its *enlightenment*." Sagasta had just given a proof of his desire to "enlighten" the Spaniards by an endeavor to make civil marriage the law of the land, and by a declaration that "if that law entailed a rupture with Rome, the government of Alfonso XII. would draw inspiration from the conduct of Charles III., and would give an example of firmness against the *obstinacy* of the Church."[1] Sagasta's project for the demoralization of Spanish society was perforce postponed to a more propitious moment; for the resistance of the Catholic deputies was then seconded by the fear, on the part of the government, of a Carlist rising in defence of legitimacy.

In just proportion with the increase of Masonic influence in Spain, the educational establishments of the kingdom had become corrupted. In many of the ecclesiastical institutions, during the reign of Charles III. (1746–1788), heretical doctrines were openly taught. Estalla, rector of the Seminary of Salamanca, and an avowed Freemason, taught a "natural religion," and therefore atheism, to the future religious teachers of the people; and the authorities of the seminaries of Osma, Cordova and Murcia soon imitated his audacity. In the time of Charles IV. (1788–1808), and for many years afterward, the once glorious Chapter of St. Isidore paraded its "enlightenment." In accordance with the system of Aranda,[2] it endeavored, nearly a century before Bismarck's similar enterprise in our day, to relegate to the regions of the past all doctrines which it chose to consider as "Jesuitical," and it did not hesitate to inoculate its students with the poison of Locke and d'Alembert. Incredulism and immorality, therefore, were not then the foreign exotics which they had hitherto been; although, just as in the Spain of to-day, the immense majority of the people remained true to their faith, and the nation was then, as now, the most moral of all the nations of continental Europe. The Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella and of Philip II. was a thing of the past; the Spain of Aranda, Urtijo, Campomanes, Jovellanos, and others of that ilk—all graduates of Masonry—was preparing the catas-

[1] *Association Catholique*, Jan. 15, 1882.

[2] See our *Studies in Church History*, vol. iv., p. 468.

trophe for the Spain which we know, the Spain of Espartero, Prim, O'Donnell, Castelar, Zorilla, Sagasta, and other Masonic pygmies, who fancied, each in his turn, that the mantle of Cardinal Ximenes had fallen on his shoulders.[1]

A natural consequence of the spread of Freemasonry in Spain was its introduction into the Spanish-American colonies. According to the "Monde Maçonnique,"[2] an organ of the Dark Lantern which has every facility for the acquisition of information concerning this and similar matters, there were, at the outbreak of the revolution against the mother-country, ninety-nine Lodges in Peru alone. That these and other Lodges were the instigators of the insurrections of 1815-1830, and that they simply obeyed the orders given by the heads of European Masonry, when they so acted, was deliberately stated by the Protestant diplomat, Count Haugwitz, in the memorial which he presented to the European sovereigns who formed the Congress of Verona in 1822; and as his assertion was not contradicted by the Masonic half of the assembly, it may be regarded as strictly true.[3] Nearly all of the

---

[1] The reader who desires to learn how the ecclesiastical authorities in Spain were prevented, during the latter part of the eighteenth century and during the first years of the nineteenth, from displaying the energy which was necessary for a successful combat with Freemasonry, will do well if he studies the work by Henry Bruck, Professor in the Seminary of Mayence, entitled *The Secret Societies in Spain*. Mayence, 1881.

[2] In the issue for March, 1875.

[3] Some passages from this memorial by Haugwitz, who was the Prussian Prime Minister of that day, ought to interest the reader. "Now that I am at the end of my career (he was then seventy years old, and had been in the Prussian cabinet nearly forty years), I think that it is my duty to draw your attention to the aims of those secret societies whose poison threatens humanity to-day more than ever. Their history is so intimately intertwined with my own that I cannot refrain from giving some details. . . . . I had scarcely attained my majority when I found myself occupying a distinguished place in the highest grades of Masonry. Before I could even know myself, before I could understand the situation into which I had rashly plunged myself, I found myself entrusted with the chief direction of a part of Prussian, Polish and Russian Masonry. As far as its secret labors were concerned, Masonry was then divided into two sections. The first affected to aim at a discovery of the philosopher's stone; its religion was Deism, or rather Atheism; its directive centre, under Dr. Zinndorf, was in Berlin. The second section, the apparent head of which was Prince F. of Brunswick, was very different. In open antagonism with each other, these two parties united in order to obtain the domination of the world, to subjugate every throne—such was their object. It would be superfluous to tell you how, in the satisfaction of my ardent curiosity, I mastered the secret of each of these sects; the truth is that the secret is no mystery for me. And that secret disgusts me. It was in 1777 that I assumed the direction of some of the Prussian Lodges; it was three or four years before the Convent of Willhelmsbad, and the invasion of the Lodges by Illuminism. My sphere of action embraced the brethren scattered through Poland and Russia. Had I not seen the fact with my own eyes, I would not believe it possible that governments could close their eyes to such a disorder as a state within a state. . . . . Our object, like that of the olden Templars, was to dominate over thrones and sovereigns. . . . . There appeared a book en-

Spanish commanders-in-chief in America during the years 1815-1830 were Freemasons; hence the numerous understandings with the rebel leaders, and hence, notably, the capitulation of the Spanish army at Ayacucho, in Peru, in 1824.[1] When the Spanish-American colonies had become independent states, then the halcyon days of Spanish-American Masonry, if we are to judge from a Masonic point of view, entered on their course. "Then," says the "Monde Maçonnique," "a love of enlightenment and of liberty arose at once, together with independence, as though from a propitious soil." The entire political history of most of the Spanish-American republics, and much of that history in the others, shows that while the soil may have been "propitious," its Masonic cultivators produced no other crops than chronic revolutions and all their attendant miseries. As for the "love of enlightenment" which the Lodges claim to have manifested in every land of Latin America during the periods when the civil power has been in their hands, it cannot be denied that if Satanic hatred of Catholicism and of its works be a test of "enlightenment," then indeed the Dark Lantern is more luminous than the sun of justice and of truth. It may be observed, however, that in Spanish and Portuguese America, just as in other Christian lands, "love of enlightenment" has not been the impelling motive of Freemasonry in its

---

titled *Errors and Truths.* This work produced a sensation, and it impressed me deeply. . . . . At once I thought that I would now learn what was hidden under the emblems of the Order; but according as I penetrated further into the dark cavern, deeper grew my conviction that there was something very different in the last recesses. The light came when I found that Saint-Martin, the author of this work, was really one of the coryphees of the Chapter of Sion. . . . . Then I acquired the firm conviction that the drama which began in 1789, the French Revolution, the regicide with all its horrors, had not only been long prepared, but that it was the result of our association, of our oaths, etc. . . . . Those who know me can judge of the effect which these discoveries produced on me. . . . . My first care was to communicate my discoveries to King William III. Both of us were convinced that all of the Masonic grades, from the lowest to the highest, were destructive of all religious principles, conducive to the execution of the most criminal designs, and that the lowest grades were used as mere mantles to cover the iniquities of the highest. This conviction, shared with me by the king, caused me to renounce Masonry absolutely; but the king deemed it prudent to abstain from an open rupture with the Order." When Haugwitz's memorial had been well discussed by the sovereigns assembled in Verona, the Prussian king alone refused to take measures against Freemasonry, and from that day the Lodges regarded Prussia as the sole continental State willing to accomplish their work, *fas aut nefas.* The emperors of Austria and Russia determined to act as energetically as their Masonic surroundings would permit. Alexander I., the Russian czar, had hitherto protected Masonry, but now he proscribed it; in 1816 he had expelled the Jesuits from his empire, but in 1824, as we have seen, he sent General Michaud to Rome to prepare the way for the return of Russia into the Catholic fold. He died mysteriously as soon as the errand of Michaud was made known. Was that death the work of Masonry?

[1] See the cited work by Bruck for several Spanish authorities for this assertion.

war to the knife against the Church. In the eyes of Freemasonry, the crying sin of the Church is not that she is ignorant rather than enlightened, despotic rather than liberal; her unpardonable fault is that she is the Church of Jesus Christ. As M. de Champagny well said, "There has ever been, from the beginning of the world, but one single war between the Church, whether patriarchal, Mosaic, or Christian, and that Proteus which was styled Paganism in ancient times, which appeared as Mohammedanism in the sixth century, which was disguised as Protestantism in the sixteenth century, which masqueraded as Incredulism in the eighteenth, and which now combats as the Revolution;"[1] and Freemasonry is the personification of each one of these pests. The Satanic sympathies of Freemasonry, whatever may be the individual sentiments of some of its adepts, are especially evinced in Latin America; for not one of the Masonic "Powers" in those regions interrupted its relations with the Grand Orient of France, when that great and shining exemplar of all the Masonic virtues erased from its Constitution the name of God and all mention of the immortality of the human soul.[2]

Elsewhere we have alluded to the peculiar tactics adopted by Freemasonry in its war against Christianity in Portugal;[3] to the deliberate attempt to corrupt the entire Portuguese clergy—an enterprise the plan of which had been sketched originally by Weisshaupt as calculated to subjugate the German priesthood, and which was recommended afterward by the Roman "Alta Vendita" as promising to place a Carbonaro on the throne of Peter.[4] This Satanic method of warfare had attained a measure of success in Germany and in Tuscany in the last years of the eighteenth century; and, as we have seen, it did not fail entirely when it was waged in Portugal in later days. With light hearts, therefore, the Brethren of the Three Points undertook in Brazil the most important campaign which they have ever conducted in Latin America. Their first victory entailed the capture of no less a personage than Don Pedro, the son and heir of John VI. In 1814 John VI. returned to Portugal, whence the Napoleonic invasion had driven him; but Don Pedro remained in Brazil and became a Mason. It is not improbable that it was the advice of his fellow-sectaries that induced Pedro to prefer an independent sceptre of Brazil to a double crown of Brazil and Portugal.[5] In a letter written to his father on July 15, 1822, he advised the old monarch to imitate

[1] *The Power of Words*, p. 31. Paris, 1880.
[2] See our *Studies*, vol. iv., p. 436.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol. v., p. 267.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 493.
[5] Clavel: *Pictorial History of Freemasonry*, pt. ii., ch. 3.

him, since, as he argued, "the Portuguese were very foolish when they felt such horror for so philanthropic an institution."[1] In 1826 Don Pedro was made Grand Master of Brazilian Masonry, and during his entire reign he endeavored to establish the order firmly in his dominions. No open attack, however, was made on Catholicism during this reign, and the same prudence was observed during the greater part of the reign of Don Pedro II. (1831–1889). But during all these years the Freemasons were insinuating themselves not only into all the religious confraternities which abound in Brazil as well as in Portugal, but also into the priesthood, and even into the episcopacy. For many years before the persecution which we are about to narrate, it was with the greatest difficulty that any person could be admitted into the Confraternity of Mt. Carmel, or into the Third Order of St. Francis, unless he was previously enrolled in some Masonic Lodge;[2] and we can perceive the significance of this alarming fact if we remember that as in Portugal, so in Brazil, few persons of any respectability did not belong to one of these or similar confraternities, so great and manifold were the religious and social advantages reaped by their members.[3] Certainly it seems strange that the adepts of Square and Triangle waited until 1872 to doff the mask which had hitherto hidden their hideousness.[4] Perhaps they had not been sure of the approbation of the emperor, Don Pedro II., a sovereign who would have liked to serve God without displeasing the devil; but it is certain that just before the persecution, when Don Pedro was about to return from his travels in North America and Europe, it was common talk in Brazil that the stay of his Majesty in Italy

[1] This letter is given in its entirety by Mencacci, in his *Documents for the History of the Italian Revolution*, vol. ii., p. 67.

[2] Deschamps: *loc. cit.*, bk. iii., ch. 35, § 1.

[3] The riots which occurred in Porto, in Portugal, in 1862, and in which the war-cry was "Down with the Sisters of Charity!" were instigated by the Third Order of St. Francis. These wonderful disciples of the Seraph of Assisi, in the letter of dismissal from their hospital which they sent to the Daughters of St. Vincent, protested that "their determination was caused by no unfavorable opinion of the Sisters." Such a remark was superfluous. They were Freemasons, and that fact explained their action.

[4] In May, 1872, the *Bulletin of the United Grand Orient of Brazil* thus manifested the designs of the order: "We are fighting to fulfil the grand humanitarian and social mission which has been reserved for our order in the universal country which is afflicted by errors a thousand years old. . . . . Our reason, our intelligence, tell us that we are progressing toward perfectibility, and the chief point is to regulate our march so as to arrive at the goal more surely. . . . . Hidden behind the screen of so-called religious beliefs, the Black Men (the priests) propagate the fatal principle of obligatory ignorance, in order to perpetuate their sacerdotal authority. . . . . The people will now tear off the bandages of slavery which the oppressors of the human conscience have placed over their eyes. . . . . The advantages of modern civilization will now take the place of the routine of centuries."

had rendered him bitter against the Holy See, and that the Brazilian Church might expect trouble.[1]

Whether or not this rumor was well-founded, the spring of 1872 was signalized by a declaration of open war, on the part of Freemasonry, against the Church of the immense majority of the Brazilians. At that time Brazilian Masonry was divided into two factions, each having its own Grand Lodge—the one being of monarchical spirit, and the other being essentially radical and revolutionary. The Grand Master of the first faction was Rio Branco, the President of the Cabinet. On March 3d the Rio Branco Masons gave a banquet to their leader, in order to congratulate him on some measures which he had induced the Parliament to vote; and one of the features of the celebration was a discourse *by a priest.* The speech was reproduced by the most important journal of the empire, the "Commercio," and the full name, position, titles, etc., of the orator were carefully detailed. The audacious ecclesiastic was immediately suspended by his bishop; and then, from every corner of Brazil, were heard the howls of "the friends of Brazilian liberty." Herod and Pilate shook hands; on April 16th the "Conservative" Grand Orient (the *Lavra Dio*) invited the Radical Grand Orient (the *Benedictinos*, so called from the place of its meeting) to sink all political differences in order to wage a more successful war against the "Black Men." That this union might be the more impressive,

---

[1] Villefranche narrates that one morning in 1872, at about seven o'clock, just as Pius IX. had finished his Mass, word was brought to His Holiness that the emperor of Brazil, who was then visiting Victor Emmanuel, desired an audience. In spite of the early hour, the Pontiff consented to receive Don Pedro. When the Brazilian had made his obeisance, the Pope said: "Well, what can I do for Your Majesty?" Don Pedro replied: "I beg Your Holiness not to call me 'Your Majesty'; at present I am the Count d'Alcantara." "Very well," said the Pope, "what can I do for the Count d'Alcantara?" "I have come," replied Don Pedro, "to ask permission to bring *the King of Italy* to Your Holiness." Villefranche says that Pius IX. arose, and with his eyes flashing, he cried, "There is no use in proposing such a thing to me. When *the King of Piedmont* restores to me my states, I may consent to receive him, but not until then shall I do so." The same interview is narrated a little differently by the Brazilian authority on whose report of the Masonic persecution Deschamps relies as being of such unimpeachable value that "it would be rash not to accord it full confidence." According to this authority, when Don Pedro had made his impudent request, the Pontiff calmly said, "My little Count, you understand nothing about these things; so don't talk about them." The pontifical retort, says the Brazilian friend of Deschamps, cut Don Pedro to the quick, and he determined to punish Pius IX. "One thing is certain," adds this authority; "before the emperor's return from Europe, it was circulated everywhere in Brazil that His Majesty had become ill-disposed toward the Church; that he was greatly excited against her, and that she might expect much misfortune. These rumors, I repeat, were heard everywhere before the return of the emperor, and events justified them."

both Orients announced in the newspapers that on a certain day the Brethren would have a solemn Mass of Requiem offered for one of their number who had just died "impenitent and unabsolved." The defiance of episcopal authority was unmistakable; but unfortunately the bishop of Rio Janeiro neglected his duty, and the Mass was celebrated with all the pomp of Masonry. Having thus vindicated their claims to popular respect in the capital, the sectaries turned their attention to the provinces. Mgr. Vital Gonçalves de Oliveiro, a prelate of sweet character and of great tact, had just been installed in his diocese of Olinda, when the journals announced, on June 27th, and in the name of the united Grand Orients, that on the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul a Mass of thanksgiving would be celebrated in the Church of St. Peter, in commemoration of the foundation of the Lodge of Olinda. In spite of his gentleness, Oliveiro was of stamina very different from that of the bishop of Rio; therefore, he immediately wrote to each pastor in his diocese a reminder that no priest could officiate or assist at a function which was avowedly Masonic. The clergy refused to do the bidding of the Orient; but the Brethren were not discouraged. On July 3d the newspapers told the public that a Mass of Requiem would be offered in the Cathedral for the repose of the soul of a recently deceased Brother, and that the Lodge of Olinda would attend with all its insignia. Again the clergy did their duty; and then the Masonic journals called on the people to protest against the wickedness of the priests "who would not pray for the dead." The bishop of Olinda was asked to refute the following argument: "Why does the bishop so insult Freemasonry as to prevent it from appearing officially at the religious functions in his churches? Masonry is a holy institution; the proof of this assertion lies in the fact that there are many Masons among his clergy, even in his Chapter, and also in the confraternities. The Freemasons are excellent Catholics, for the same hands which carry the mallet in the Lodges carry the sacred banners and images in religious processions." On December 28th Mgr. Oliveiro sent a circular to all his clergy, calling on them to procure either an abjuration from all the Masonic members of the confraternities, or a resignation of their membership.[1] It was

[1] The reader must know that in this term "confraternities" were included in Brazil, as in Portugal, not only organizations like those to which that name is given in other countries, but also those bodies which had been instituted by Pombal for the administration of the business affairs of the parishes, but principally in order to attenuate the authority of the bishops. These parochial "confraternities" were very different from our Board of Trustees or the French *Conseils de Fabrique*, or the Italian *Fabriche;*

found that in some of the confraternities there were no Freemasons; but there were too many which proved that the sectaries had not belied them, and these were disciplined by the interdiction of their special chapels. As was to be expected, and as the Masons had hoped, the censured confraternities continued to hold their accustomed services in their interdicted chapels, one of their number presiding when no priest could be induced to officiate. They also continued to attend, in their special regalia, at all the parochial services in their churches. In the diocese of Para everything happened as in that of Olinda; and the parish clergy of each diocese were notified by the rebels that if the confraternities were not allowed to appear in church and to receive the Blessed Sacrament "in their Masonic capacity," the said confraternities would remove the sacred vestments from the churches, and would take possession of the keys of the Tabernacles. The threat was fulfilled; and whenever a priest was summoned to give the Holy Viaticum to the dying, he was obliged to humiliate himself before the president of his Masonic confraternity, unless time allowed him to go to the Tabernacle in the episcopal residence, or to that in one of the convents. In none of the parishes of Olinda and Para was Mass now offered; and the interdicted confraternities confiscated to secular purposes (or to their individual pockets) the moneys which had been placed in their care for the celebration of Masses for the dead, or for other pious intentions. These diabolic outrages could not continue in a Catholic community without much risk of life and limb on the part of the perpetrators; the people are not always as patient as their spiritual advisers. It became necessary, therefore, for the "Masonic Catholics" to invoke the aid of the civil authority against the Canons of the Church. They appealed to the Parliament, not having considered that the deputies of the people might sustain the authority of the bishops; but their mistake was perceived by the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, a notorious Freemason, and he advised them to appeal to his tribunal. The advice was followed; and with Masonry as a judge in a case to which it was a party, the issue was not doubtful. On June 12, 1873, an imperial decree ordered the bishops to withdraw the interdict which they had pronounced against the confraternities, the government alleging that the Papal condemnation of Freemasonry was of no value, since it had never received the royal *exequatur*, or, in plain lan-

they not only handled the parochial funds, but they arranged all festive celebrations, and invited whom they pleased to assist at them. They wore special costumes, and attended all marriages, funerals, and very many civil functions.

guage, since His Brazilian Majesty had not accorded to it his gracious approbation. By a strange coincidence, at the very moment that the decree of Don Pedro II. was placed in the hands of Mgr. Oliveiro, he received also the Papal Brief, *Quanquam dolores*, in which, under date of May 29th, Pius IX. approved all that he and the bishop of Para had done in the matter of the Freemasons, and ordered him to communicate this approbation to the entire Brazilian hierarchy. The bishop of Olinda therefore wrote to the emperor: "Sire, I hold now in one hand your order to raise the interdict which I have inflicted, and in the other hand I hold a Brief in which His Holiness commends all that I have done in that matter. Your Majesty shall judge whether I am free to obey your commands."

Oliveiro immediately published the Papal Brief throughout his diocese, and the government summoned him to answer for the "crime" of publishing a document from Rome without the royal permission. But when it was learned that all the bishops in the empire had been equally guilty, the trial was postponed indefinitely, and other and more radical measures were taken against the principal offender. On January 2, 1874, an imperial commissary presented himself at the residence of the intrepid prelate in Pernambuco. When informed that the officer was charged with the unpleasant task of arresting him, Oliveiro replied that he would yield only to force. Then the commissary laid his hand on the bishop's arm—the conventional sign that force was being used—and the prisoner asked to be allowed to retire to his private rooms for a few moments. Permission having been accorded, Oliveiro withdrew. When seated in his chamber, he rapidly wrote a protest against the governmental proceedings. Then he put on all his pontifical robes, and went to his private chapel. After a moment of prayer, he opened the door, and asked the waiting commissary: "*Quem quæritis?*" Then he read his protest, and followed the officer to the man-of-war which was to convey him to Rio. Having arrived in the capital, he was confined in the arsenal for three days, and then he was visited by certain officers, who asked him what he had to say in answer to the charges which they read to him. No answer could be made; for, as a Catholic bishop, Oliveiro could not admit the competency of a secular tribunal in religious matters. But he asked for paper, wrote a few words, and sealed the document. When the judges who were to try his case assembled, they were very anxious to learn the nature of his pleading; but when the important paper was opened, it was found to contain: "*Jesus autem tacebat.*" On

February 21st the daring criminal was condemned to four years of hard labor in a fortress; but Don Pedro deigned to alleviate the sentence by exempting his victim from the hard labor. Immediately after the disposal of the case of the bishop of Olinda, that of Mgr. Macedo, the bishop of Para, received the same treatment, and ended in the same manner. After two years of imprisonment, both prelates were graciously "pardoned" by the emperor. But the bishop of Para was destined to undergo many more painful experiences at the hands of the Masonic apostles of "enlightenment and liberty." The most notable of these sufferings was that which was entailed by his condemnation of the Confraternity of Our Lady of Nazareth, an institute which, founded in 1842 for noble purposes of mutual edification, had latterly fallen almost entirely into the clutches of Masonry. In October, 1877, this association was celebrating one of its feasts with a grand procession, when suddenly the spectators were shocked by the sight of pictures of entirely naked women, and of other representations even more obscene, amid the images of Jesus, Mary and the saints.[1] The episcopal condemnation of this sacrilege, accentuated by an interdict of the chapel of the culpable confraternity, entailed legal proceedings which lasted for more than two years, and finally the Masons gained their cause; for the president of the province, Goma y Abreu, was an adept. On the night of the day when it had been decided that the sacrilegious organization should retain possession of its chapel, the brethren passed in procession before the palace of the bishop, insulting him with hootings and groans. The religious images were carried, as usual, in this procession; but the character of the participants was shown by the fact that nearly all wore their hats and had cigars in their mouths; and in order that the victory might be more clearly understood as one of Masonry, the rooms of the Lodge of Para were grandly illuminated during the festivities, and the brethren furnished the populace with an expensive exhibition of fireworks, the chief features of which were Masonic emblems.[2] But in spite of the apparent triumph of the Lodges over the bishops of Olinda and Para, the more perspicacious of the brethren could not fail to perceive that their outrageous violations of law and justice, to say nothing of their open scorn of all that most Brazilians held as dearer than life, were drawing to the clergy the sympathies of all honest men, and were tightening the bond of unity between the hierarchy and

---

[1] Thus the Paris *Univers* of November 10, 1879, quoting the *Diario de Belem.*

[2] The *Univers* of December 31, 1879, quoting the *Boa Nova de Para.*

the priests. Therefore it was decided in the superior councils of the Dark Lantern that there should be a cessation of the high-handed proceedings of the previous seven years; that there should be a recourse to the more prudent wiles of European Masonry; that, in fine, the order should endeavor to gain possession of the family, and to control the education of the young.

This resolution was foreshadowed in the address which Saldanha Marinho, the Prime Minister, delivered on the occasion of his installation as Grand Master of the United Grand Orients of Brazil: "I now assume, before you and before Brazil, the onerous duty of defending zealously those grand social ideas, the realization of which is the aim of every free people. . . . . I have always opposed the logic of truth to the subtleties of *Jesuitism;* the serenity of my conscience to the sophisms of hypocrisy; the rights of free reason to the excesses of fanaticism; the spread of healthy teaching to the propagation of error and obscurantism. . . . . Strong though he may be in the possession of truth, no one man can succeed in this propaganda of generous ideas; and here is revealed the power of our order. You have already demonstrated your good will and your zeal by a generous supply of the resources which are necessary for the success of the mission which I have undertaken; and, thanks to that aid, during the last seven years I have sent into the farthest corners of the empire, and even into foreign lands, the echo of our complaints and aspirations, and our demand for the restoration of rights which have been suffocated by the armies of fanaticism and superstition. . . . . The task which we have proposed to ourselves, and not merely in the name of Masonry, but for its sake, since the upholding of these principles involves the very existence of the order, is to procure the institution of *civil marriages, so as to free our fellow-citizens from the tyranny of an exclusive and intolerant Church;* and, secondly to obtain the *secularization of all cemeteries, thereby protecting the mortal remains of the dead from the insults of a religious sect which pretends to extend its power into the domain of the Infinite.*"[1] But Saldanha Marinho relinquished his portfolio in 1880; and the new cabinet, beyond an enforcement of the principle of governmental supervision of education, evinced no desire to aid the Masonic propaganda. So "clerical," in fact, did the new administration show itself, that it even ventured to allow the Capuchins to undertake the evangelization of such of the Brazilian tribes as were still Pagan. The bishops were allowed compara-

[1] *Journal of Belgian Masonry*, Dec. 8, 1879.

tive freedom in the exercise of their pastoral duties; and large numbers of the deluded sectaries, who had learned from the recent persecution that Masonry was not an inoffensive and merely benevolent association, made their formal abjurations. The advent of the Republic, proclaimed in 1889, gave great encouragement to the Brethren of the Three Points; the laws were all revised in a Masonic sense; but hitherto the fervent Catholicism of the nation has prevented any open and extraordinary persecution of the Church.

While the "Liberator," Simon Bolivar, was fighting for the independence of Columbia,[1] the civil administration of the country was in the hands of the vice-president, General Santander, a democrat like the President, but a man of pronouncedly Masonic heart. Bolivar would have willingly allowed the Church to live at peace in a free state; but Santander could perceive no happiness in a state which did not hold the Church in slavery. By means of a Lodge which he founded in Bogota, entitled a "Society for Enlightenment," and of which he caused himself to be elected "Venerable," he spread the poison of a bastard Liberalism among the people, inoculating them with the notion that they would never be really free, until Columbia possessed a truly Liberal Constitution, and that such a panacea would never be obtained unless they ceased to elect to the Congress men who were "reactionaries, fanatics, and secret partisans of the Spanish Government."

In 1821 an imposing majority of Freemasons greeted General Santander when he met the new Congress in Cucuta. The first move of the precious body was to abolish the article of the Constitution which declared that the Catholic religion was that of the State; and the pretext was the non-necessity of such a declaration in a Catholic republic. When the leader of the minority, Dr. Banos, announced that his party could not vote for an enactment which was "radically vicious," he was instantly expelled from the Congress. Of course the Congress voted for the abolition of the Inquisition, which had been dead, to all intents and purposes, for many years; and it also decreed that the right of censorship should be vested in the government alone—a power which Santander immediately exercised by authorizing the publication of the works of Voltaire, Helvetius, Diderot, Bentham, as well as of many immoral pamphlets. The Congress also prepared the way for a schism, that favorite engine of Satan when

[1] Such was the name given in 1810 to the republic formed by the confederation of Venezuela, New Granada and Equador.

heresy is not immediately possible. The Holy See had allowed the Spanish sovereigns to exercise a *jus patronatus* in the nomination of bishops and in the administration of the ecclesiastical revenues, and the Congress pretended to have inherited this right from the defunct government. Then, in order to banish the last effects of "centuries of intellectual slavery," the Congress imposed a new plan of studies on the universities, and even on the ecclesiastical seminaries. One of the obligatory text-books was the work of the materialist and atheist, Bentham; and when a certain eminent professor, Dr. Margallo, stigmatized this author as impious, he was thrown into prison. Restrepo, the historiographer of Columbia and a friend of Santander, is constrained to say of this republican tyranny: "This congressional legislation made a *tabula rasa* of the customs, as well as of the religious convictions, of the nation; in a word, it was a complete anomaly in face of the sentiments of the people. Therefore the simple announcement of another session of this Congress caused as much consternation as though an earthquake or a hurricane had been predicted. In fact, such Congresses, being composed almost exclusively of lawyers and of lads who were crammed full of French theories (those of 1789), had but one object—to impregnate Columbia with the doctrines of Voltaire and Rousseau."[1] Had the Masonico-Liberal administration given to the people some material compensation for the impieties with which it deluged the land, the spirit of the world might have triumphed in Columbia; but brigandage, devastation, military executions for pretended royalism, and rapine of every kind, became the order of the day. This condition of affairs caused every lover of order and of common decency to call on Bolivar, the man who had liberated them from the "yoke of the Spaniards," to free them from the more intolerable yoke of Masonic Liberalism; some begged him to restore the Spanish domination; others, and the most respectable of all, suggested that he might don a crown as "Emperor of the Andes." These clamors reached Bolivar immediately after his great victory of Potosi, obtained on April 1, 1825, and by which he had liberated Peru. He prepared immediately to proceed to Columbia, and in the meantime he forwarded a proclamation announcing his journey: "The noise of your discords has reached me, even in Peru, and I return to you with an olive-branch in my hand. If your disorders do not cease,

[1] *History of Columbia*, cited by Berthe in his *Garcia Moreno, President of Equador, Avenger of Christian Right, and Its Martyr.* Paris, 1887.

anarchy and consequent death will triumph over the ruins of Columbia." During the ensuing three years the efforts of the Liberator to endow his compatriots with peace and prosperity were continually thwarted by the Santanderist Masons; the Lodges had resolved to rule, or to bury Bolivar and Columbia in the same tomb. But a crisis arrived on Sept. 25, 1828, when, at the hour of midnight, a band of these partisans of liberty and enlightenment assailed the presidential palace, and with daggers in hand forced their way to the bedroom of Bolivar, crying for his death. The attempt failed; the president had escaped by a secret passage. The leading assassins were shot; and Santander, convicted of complicity, was banished. Then the Liberator issued the following decree: "Considering, firstly, that the State would be soon brought to ruin if impunity were accorded to criminals and rebels, I resume the dictatorial power with which the people invested me. Considering, secondly, that *Secret Societies have the planning of political revolutions for their principal object, and that their baneful character is sufficiently manifested by the mystery with which they surround themselves, I order the suppression of all such societies, and the closing of their Lodges.*" Then, exhorting the clergy to inculcate unceasingly the principles of Christian morality, he continued: "It is because the country has abandoned correct principles that a spirit of madness has taken possession of it. In order to neutralize the wicked theories with which the people have become saturated, let the clergy preach obedience and respect to all." Finally, being persuaded that the youth of Columbia were being poisoned by the doctrines then in vogue in the universities, he decreed that the entire curriculum should be revised in a Christian sense, and that a profound study of religion should be introduced, "so that the young men of the nation might have weapons wherewith to combat impiety and their own passions." Nothing but sad experience and the ascendency of truth could have wrung these admissions from Bolivar, for during his early years he had advocated the principles of 1789 almost to the point of deifying the Revolution. The adepts of Square and Triangle never forgave the Liberator for his declaration of these Christian sentiments; and, had not the day been near when his partisans would be obliged to appeal again to the polls for the approbation of the electors, he would have paid for his temerity with his life. In the meantime the people were made to believe that every vote cast for a partisan of the dictator would be a vote for a Columbian monarchy, and when

the elections had been held, it was found that the Masonic candidates had triumphed in nearly every instance.

On January 13, 1830, the new Congress assembled; and in spite of the entreaties of his friends, and although the diplomatic corps promised its unanimous support if he would retain his dictatorship, the Liberator resigned his office, never, as he protested, to assume it again. "And now," he wrote to the Congress, "*let my last official act be to recommend Congress to protect continually our holy religion, the fruitful source of the blessings of heaven; and to entreat Congress to restore its sacred and imprescriptible rights to public instruction, which has been made a cancer for Columbia. . . . . Fellow-citizens, I must say, and with the blush of shame on my brow, that while we have won our independence, it has been won at the expense of every other blessing.* . . . . For twenty years I have served you as soldier and as magistrate. During that long period we have freed our country, procured liberty for three republics, repressed many civil wars, and four times I have resigned to the people the supreme power which they confided to me. To-day I fear that I may be an obstacle to your happiness, and therefore I resign, for the last time, the magistracy with which you have honored me. The most unworthy suspicions have been expressed in my regard, and I have been unable to defend myself. A crown has been offered to me frequently by men who are now ambitious of supreme power, but I always refused that crown with the indignation of a sincere republican. I swear that a desire for a throne has never stained my soul. Columbians, I conjure you to heed my last entreaty. Be united, and do not become the assassins of your country!" On May 8th Bolivar departed from Carthagena, with the intention of sailing for Europe. While waiting for the ship which he was not destined to board, he heard of the dismemberment of the Columbia which he had founded. Venezuela had become independent under the presidency of General Paez. The three departments of Equador, namely, Quito, Cuenca and Guayaquil, had become autonomous under the rule of General Flores. His dearest friend, Marshal Soucre, the victor of Ayacucho, had been assassinated by his rivals—a crime which caused the Liberator to say: "It is the blood of Abel that has been shed." He heard also that the students in Bogota—lads who were pupils of Masonic instructors—were amusing themselves by making a target of his portrait. Perhaps he was not surprised when General Urdaneta, having made a kind of *coup d'état* in order to save the remnants of Columbia, sent to him a deputation with entreaties that he would undertake the restoration of the

republic. His reply was: "A gate of brass separates me from power—legality. I cannot assume an authority with which another has been invested." His friends begged him to think of his dying country; but he replied: "There is no hope for my country. Such is my conviction, and my despair." The moral agony which such reflections entailed on Bolivar brought him to the tomb. Having been taken to the city of Santamarta, where his friends thought that he might obtain sufficient strength to enable him to prosecute his European trip, the bishop told him that he was at the point of death. He received the Last Sacraments with edifying fervor, and died in his forty-eighth year, on December 17, 1830, a victim of Masonic treachery and of Masonic essential lack of patriotism.

The Republic of Equador, born of the dismemberment of that ephemeral creation of Bolivar, the Republic of Columbia, was subjected for many years to the pretendedly "Conservative Liberalism" which found its fit exponents in men like Flores, Rocafuerte, and Roca. This Liberalism exhibited the sovereignty of the people as its essential principle; but its Conservatism consisted in preserving itself in power, even in spite of the will of the nation. The hybrid did not trouble itself to persecute the Church, so long as the Church showed herself willing to serve as its obsequious servant. Under the rule of Urbina and Robles hypocritical Conservatism disappeared, and unblushing Radicalism seemed destined to consummate a ruin which was already more than half completed. But a new era dawned for Equador in 1861, when Garcia Moreno was elected to the too frequently prostituted presidential office. In his first message to the Congress the new president asked that body to adopt a Constitution which would be Catholic in every sense of the term—one which would furnish "the sole means of regenerating the country by an energetic repression of crime, by giving a solid education to youth, and by protecting the holy religion of our ancestors, so that by the aid of that religion we may procure a realization of reforms which neither government nor laws can effect by their own unaided efforts." The draft of a Constitution which Moreno submitted began with the declaration that the Holy Catholic and Roman Religion was the sole Religion of the State. But the Freemasons, who, in spite of the generally Catholic result of the recent elections, had obtained a few seats in the Congress, could not miss this opportunity of protesting against "a retrograde legislation." One of the sectaries, a priest, declaimed a discourse of Mirabeau in theatrical style, concluding with the sage observation that "since God

is as visible as the sun, it would be an injurious superfluity to recognize Him officially." Such reasoning did not convince the deputies; the entire Constitution was adopted, and Moreno found himself free to endow Equador with the blessings of a truly liberal and Christian government. Our limits do not permit any detailed narrative of all that was effected for his country by this "modern St. Louis." The loud-mouthed praters about popular enlightenment should have admired him; for when they murdered him, the free schools of the republic numbered 500, with 32,000 pupils, whereas under the Masonic government there had been only 200 schools, with 8000 pupils. The spirit which animated Garcia Moreno is indicated in the message which he had prepared for the Congress as he was about to enter on his third term of office, when the Masonic assassins sent him to his reward in heaven: "Only a few years have elapsed since Equador repeated every day the lament which the Liberator, Bolivar, expressed in his last message to the Congress of 1830: 'I must say, and with the blush of shame on my brow, that while we have won our independence, it has been won at the expense of every other blessing.' But since that time, having placed our trust in God, and having abandoned the course of impiety and apostasy which attracts the world in this epoch of blindness, we have reorganized ourselves into a thoroughly Catholic nation, and therefore each day has beheld an increase of happiness and prosperity in our beloved country. Once Equador was a body from which life was departing; it was being already devoured, just as a corpse is devoured by a multitude of those hideous insects which the freedom of putrefaction allows to develop in the darkness of the grave. But to-day, obeying the Sovereign Voice which commanded Lazarus to issue from his tomb, Equador returns to new life, although she still retains the winding-sheet of death, that is, some remnants of the misery and corruption in which she was once wrapped. In order to justify my words, I need only render an account of our progress during the last two years, referring you to the special reports of each ministerial department for documents and details; and, in order that you may perceive the extent of our progress during this period of regeneration, I shall compare the present conditions with those which once obtained. And I shall institute this comparison, not for our self-glorification, but in order to glorify Him to whom we owe everything, and whom we adore as our Redeemer, Father, Protector, God. . . . . To the perfect liberty which the Church now enjoys among us, and to the apostolic zeal of our virtuous pastors, we owe a reformation of the clergy, an improvement in morals, and

so great a diminution in the number of crimes, that in our population of more than a million there are not enough of criminals to fill our penitentiary. To the Church we owe those religious organizations which constantly produce such happy results in the education of the young, and in the care of the sick and the poor. . . . . If I have committed any errors, I ask your pardon a thousand times; but I am sure that my will has not been at fault. But if, on the contrary, you find that I have succeeded in my endeavors, attribute all the merit, firstly, to God and the Immaculate Dispenser of the inexhaustible treasures of God's mercies; and, secondly, to yourselves, to the people, to the army, and to all the members of the administration who have seconded my efforts so admirably."

A strange document, truly, in the closing years of the nineteenth century—a document which could never have emanated from a Cavour or a Bismarck, a Gambetta or a Thiers, a Metternich or a Von Beust, a Palmerston or a Gladstone. But all the messages of Garcia Moreno to the Equadorian Congress had sounded the same notes, and all of his governmental acts had accorded with his professions. When Victor Emmanuel completed his series of sacrilegious robberies by the seizure of the Papal capital in 1870, Garcia Moreno was the sole potentate in Christendom who protested against the iniquity. Immediately after the news of the crime had reached Quito, the president of Equador dictated to his foreign secretary the following protest, which was sent at once, according to constitutional formality, to the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs: "The undersigned, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Equador, has the honor of addressing the following protest to His Excellency, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of King Victor Emmanuel, because of the melancholy events which occurred last September in the capital of the Catholic world. Since the very existence of Catholicism has been menaced in the person of its august head, the representative of Catholic unity, who has been despoiled of that temporal dominion which is the necessary guarantee of his independence in the exercise of his divine mission, Your Excellency will admit that every Catholic, and with much more reason every government which rules over a considerable number of Catholics, not only has the right, but is also bound to protest against this hideous and sacrilegious crime. However, before raising its voice, the Government of Equador waited for protests on the part of the more powerful states of Europe against the unjust and violent seizure of Rome; and it waited for what would have been

much more gratifying—that His Majesty, King Victor Emmanuel, would voluntarily do homage to the sacred character of the noble Pontiff who governs the Church by restoring its stolen territories to the Holy See. But the Equadorian Government waited in vain; the monarchs of the old continent remain mute, and Rome continues to suffer under the oppression of Victor Emmanuel. For this reason the Government of Equador, in spite of its feebleness, and in spite of the enormous distance which separates it from the Old World, now fulfills its duty by protesting before God and before men, and especially in the name of the Catholic people of Equador, against the wicked invasion of Rome and the subjugation of the Roman Pontiff—deeds which have been perpetrated in violation of repeated promises, and which are now disguised by derisory guarantees of independence which do not hide the ignominious servitude of the Church. The Equadorian Government protests, finally, against the consequences which the Holy See and the Church will suffer because of this shameful abuse of power. While addressing this protest to you by formal order of His Excellency, the President of this Republic, the undersigned still trusts that King Victor Emmanuel will repair the injuries which he has inflicted in a moment of madness, before his throne is reduced to ashes by the avenging fire of the Revolution."[1]

Not content with this personal protest, Garcia Morena urged all the governments of South America to follow his example; but, as he afterwards said: "I had little hope that our sister republics would respond to the invitation; I merely wished to fulfill my duty as a Catholic by giving the greatest possible publicity to our own protest. Columbia replied in moderate terms, but negatively; Costa Rica answered negatively and in an insolent manner; Bolivia informed me very courteously that she would consider the matter carefully; Chili and Peru did not condescend to acknowledge the receipt of my communication. But, after all, what does it matter? *God has no need of us in order to accomplish His designs, and He will accomplish them in spite of hell, and in spite of the emissaries of hell, the Freemasons, who are more or less masters in every land of South America, saving our own.*"[2] The Brethren of the Three Points were not then masters in Equador, but their perennial efforts to obtain the supremacy were redoubled when Garcia Moreno so nobly stigmatized the chief masterpiece of their craft in the nineteenth century.

---

[1] *El Nacional*, of Quito, January 18, 1871.

[2] Berthe: *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., ch. ii.

In 1873 the sectaries were spurred to a definitive enterprise by a realization that Equador was indeed lost to them unless "the modern St. Louis" was deprived of power. Garcia Moreno, a president of an American republic, and in this enlightened nineteenth century, had proposed to an American Congress that the country they represented should be solemnly consecrated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the Congress had passed the resolution without discussion, and unanimously.[1] The "apostle of ignorance and of superstition" was sentenced to death in the secret councils of the Dark Lantern; but, as usual in the execution of Masonic sentences of the highly placed, the "removal" was to be made to appear as the natural result of the crimes of the victim. Incendiary pamphlets were scattered broadcast throughout Equador, all exhibiting Moreno as a fit subject for popular execration. Thus, the infamous Moncayo described him as a cruel hypocrite: "He avows himself a partisan of the *Syllabus*, in order to commit crimes at his convenience. Communicating and shooting; proscribing, scourging and confiscating; such are

[1] In the beginning of April, 1873, the bishops of Equador met in the Third Plenary Council of Quito, and Moreno informed them of his desire that they would do their part toward consecrating the republic to the Sacred Heart. On April 13th the synodals decreed that "the greatest happiness of a people being the preservation of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman faith, and since that preservation depends on the mercy of God, the nation should humbly seek the Heart of Jesus in order to obtain that blessing. Therefore the Council of Quito solemnly offers and consecrates the republic to the Sacred Heart, supplicating that Heart to be the protector, guide and defender of this country, so that it may never wander from the Catholic Apostolic and Roman faith, and that all the inhabitants of Equador, conforming their lives to that faith, may find in it their happiness in time and in eternity." As soon as this decree was conveyed to the president he laid it before the Congress, and that body immediately decreed: "Considering that the Third Plenary Council of Quito has by a special decree consecrated the republic to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, placing us all under the protection of that Heart, it befits the representatives of the nation to associate themselves with an act which is so conformable to their eminently Catholic sentiments. Considering that this act, so efficacious for the preservation of our faith, is also the best means for assuring the prosperity and progress of the State, the Congress decrees that the republic, consecrated forever to the Heart of Jesus, adopts that Heart as its Patron and Protector. The Feast of the Sacred Heart shall be hereafter a civil holiday of the first-class, and shall be celebrated in every cathedral in the most solemn manner possible. Furthermore, in order to excite the zeal and piety of the faithful, there shall be erected in every cathedral an altar dedicated to the Sacred Heart, in front of which there shall be placed, at the expense of the state, a slab commemorative of the present decree." As we have said, this decree was passed unanimously. On the day appointed for the public ceremony of the consecration, while the function was being performed in each of the five other cathedrals of the republic, the president and Congress proceeded in grand state to the cathedral of Quito. After the archbishop had promulgated the decree in the name of the Church, Garcia Moreno repeated it in the name of the Republic of Equador. Has any ruler of modern times thus brought before the minds of his people the days of Charlemagne and of St. Louis?

the offerings which please the God of the Jesuits." From Lima there came a pretended "History of Equador," in which the following Masonic instigation to murder was read: "In that nation which has exterminated so many tyrants there is still energy enough to deliver it from this most detestable despotism. Let the ferocious terrorist and his accomplices tremble before the justice of the sovereign people! The young, the crowds, need no general to lead them to the combat. When suffering arrives to a certain degree of intensity, a martyr arises to lay the oppressor low." In a diatribe entitled, "A Perpetual Dictatorship," the impious Montalvo accused Moreno of having driven many women of the street to suicide, because they preferred death to a residence in the asylum of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. The consecration to the Sacred Heart, said Montalvo, had turned Equador into a convent of idiots, with a permanent scaffold on the premises.[1] From time to time the Masonic journals throughout South America published accounts of Moreno's assassination, undoubtedly with the idea of impressing upon the popular mind the necessity of such a catastrophe. Thus, on October 26, 1873, twenty-two months before the real murder, a despatch from Guayaquil informed Peru that Moreno had just "fallen under the dagger of his aide-de-camp, Colonel Salazar, who had been helped by a crowd of persons who were hostile to the Jesuits. Twenty-three Jesuits perished with the president, and the people would have killed the Papal nuncio as well, had he not succeeded in escaping to the mountains." Frequently Moreno was warned from reliable sources that the Lodges had decreed his death, and that he should never go abroad without an escort. He always replied that if the Masons had decreed his assassination, no human means would prolong his life; that, however, he was in the hands of God. In reply to one of these warnings he said: "I have already learned from Germany that the German Lodges have instructed those of America to move heaven and earth to overthrow the government of Equador. Probably Grand Master X. is concerned in this instruction; but if God extends his mercy to us, what have we to fear, even though our power is equal to zero, when compared with the power of that clay-footed Colossus?"

[1] The charges of Montalvo were so absurdly calumnious that Charles Weile, who had been consul of the United States in Quito, was constrained to write to the *San Francisco Chronicle:* "These accusations cause a smile of pity and contempt on the part of all who have known Garcia Moreno. Having resided in Equador very many years, and being perfectly acquainted with all that has recently occurred there, I know well what I say; and I do not exaggerate when I declare that to me Garcia Moreno appears to be the most illustrious man that South America ever produced."

In July, 1875, Moreno wrote the following letter to Pope Pius IX.: "Most Holy Father, I implore your blessing, having been chosen again, without any merit on my part, to rule this Catholic republic during the coming six years. The new presidential term does not commence until August 30th, when I take the oath to the Constitution, and then I shall dutifully inform your Holiness officially of the fact; but I wish to obtain your blessing before that day, so that I may have the strength and the light which I need so much in order to be unto the end a faithful son of our Redeemer, and a loyal and obedient servant of His infallible Vicar. Now that the Masonic Lodges of the neighboring countries, instigated by Germany,[1] are vomiting against me all sorts of atrocious insults and horrible calumnies; now, also, that the Lodges are secretly arranging for my assassination; I have more need than ever of the Divine protection, so that I may live and die in defence of our holy religion, and for the dear republic which I am called once more to rule. What happiness can be mine, Most Holy Father, so great as that of being hated and calumniated for the sake of our Divine Redeemer? And how great a happiness your blessing will be to me if it procures for me from heaven the privilege of shedding my blood for the God who shed His own for us on the cross!" On the evening of August 5th a priest demanded audience with the president, stating that his business could not be deferred. When in the presence of Moreno, he said: "You have been warned that the Freemasons have decreed your death, but you have not been told when the sentence will be executed. I come to tell you that your days are numbered; that the conspirators have resolved to murder you as soon as opportunity offers. Probably the deed will be committed to-morrow; therefore, take your measures accordingly." Moreno quietly answered: "I have received many similar warnings; and, after mature reflection, I have come to the conclusion that there is but one measure for me to take, and that this measure is to keep myself in a state wherein I shall be fit to meet my God." Then he proceeded with his work, which was the preparation of the message, some passages of which we have given. At six o'clock on the following morning, August 6th, the Feast of the Transfigura-

[1] During the infamous Bismarckian "War for Civilization," it was the general belief among the Catholics of South America that the German chancellor was the prime mover of all the Masonic manœuvres in their regions; that he took this means of adding to the embarrassments of the Holy See, while he was endeavoring to constitute a German National Church. Certainly the word of the well-informed and calmly judicious Garcia Moreno gives more than plausibility to the belief.

tion of Our Lord, Moreno assisted at Mass, according to his daily habit, in the church of St. Dominic;[1] and he received Holy Communion, undoubtedly fully prepared to recognize the Holy Eucharist as, in all probability, the Viaticum for his momentous journey. Having returned to his residence, he spent some time with his family, and then gave some finishing touches to his message. Shortly after midday he left his palace, followed at a little distance by an aide-de-camp, his intention being to read his message to the Congress. On the way he entered the cathedral, and prayed before the Blessed Sacrament for nearly an hour. Leaving the house of God, he turned his steps toward the Government House, on the opposite side of the Great Square; but he had walked only a few yards when seven assassins rushed on him. One of the murderers cried: "Die, strangler of liberty!" and as the martyr of liberty fell, pierced by six bullets and by fourteen dagger-strokes, he cried in a clear voice: "I die, but God does not die—*Pero Dios no se muere.*"[2] From among the innumerable panegyrics on Garcia Moreno we select the following tribute from the pen of Louis Veuillot: "Garcia Moreno was beyond vulgarity, indifference, and forgetfulness; he would have been beyond hatred, if God could permit that virtue should not entail hatred. It may be said of Moreno that he was the most *antique* of all moderns; he was a man who did honor to humanity. It was not sufficient for him to be one of Plutarch's characters; he entertained an idea of grandeur which was vaster and more just than that of Plutarch. Alone, unknown, but sustained by faith and his great heart, he effected all that Plutarch describes

[1] Moreno never missed his daily Mass; and every day he read a chapter of the New Testament and one of the *Imitation*. Every evening he recited the Rosary, generally with his family.

[2] The crime of 1875 was not the first that Masonry perpetrated against the life of Moreno. Shortly after the final catastrophe, the Roman *Civiltà Cattolica*, the calmest and most unsensational periodical in Europe, narrated how, in the fall of 1869, a certain Equadorian scientist received satisfactory proof that the Lodges had even at that time resolved to murder the great president. This gentleman had studied in various European universities; among others, in that of Berlin. When about to return home, where a professorship in the University of Quito awaited him, he called upon one of his Berlinese professors in order to bid him farewell. The young man had won the admiration and affection of the German, who was highly placed in the councils of the Dark Lantern. When the old Freemason learned that his friend was about to accept a professorship to which he had been appointed by Garcia Moreno, whom the youth greatly admired, he remarked that there was no sense in accepting favors from a man who would be dead before the ambitious lad arrived in Equador. The words produced no deep impression in the mind of the hearer; but when he arrived in Guayaquil he learned that the president had just escaped assassination, and that very foolishly the chief criminal, Cornejo, had been punished merely by banishment for eight years.

his worthiest heroes as having effected; and he did all this in accordance with his natural character, and by a careful observance of a rule which he had planned for himself. But he did more; continually aiming higher, he dared to attempt a task that our epoch deems impossible. In the government of Equador he was a man of Jesus Christ. Let us salute this noble figure, the most beautiful of modern times; it is worthy of history. A man of Jesus Christ; that is, a man of God, in public life! And he was, as the phrase runs, a man of his time; he studied the sciences of his time, he appreciated its habits, he understood its customs and laws; but nevertheless, he was never aught else than an exact follower of the Gospel, a faithful servant of God; and he made his people, who had been Christian indeed, but were being devoured by Socialism, a people faithful in the service of God. It was a little republic of South America that showed this wonder to the world. Moreno was a Christian, and one of a stamp not at all affected by our modern rulers; he was one of those leaders of whom the nations have lost all remembrance; he was a dispenser of justice, such as the seditious and the conspirators of our day seldom meet. In Moreno there was something of Medicis, and something of Ximenes. He was Medicis, less the trickery of that prince; he was Ximenes, less the cardinalitial scarlet. Of both Medicis and Ximenes he had the genius, the magnificence, and the love of country. What is wanting in the glory of Garcia Moreno? Nothing. He furnished a unique example to the world amid which he lived; he was an honor to his country; and perhaps his death was the greatest service that he rendered to his people. He showed the human race what valor and faith can effect when they are united to enlightened patriotism."[1]

On Sept. 20, 1875, Pope Pius IX., in one of those eloquent Allocutions in which the Captive of the Vatican was wont to unmask the designs of the persecutors of the Church, described the work of Masonry in France, Germany, and Switzerland; and then turning his discourse to South America, he said: "Amid all these governments thus delivered to the delirium of impiety, Equador has been miraculously distinguished for its spirit of justice, and for the indomitable faith of its president. But alas! even in Equador there are not wanting some impious men who consider it an insult to their pretended modern civilization that there should be found a government which, while devoting itself to the material welfare of its people, endeavors at the same time

[1] In the *Univers*, September 27, 1875.

to assure the moral and spiritual progress of that people. These valiant men decided to murder their illustrious president, and he succumbed to the steel of the assassins, a victim of his faith, and of his Christian love for his country." Freemasonry did not attain to power immediately after it had murdered Garcia Moreno; Borrero, the successor of the martyr, was a Liberal, but nevertheless a good Catholic. But in 1877 a creature of the Lodges, a drunken soldier named Vintimilla, was raised to a dictatorship, and a carnival of Masonry was initiated. A decree for the secularization of education, that is, for an atheistic training of the young, was issued immediately; and when the pastors, with the bishop of Riobamba at their head, protested against the iniquity, another decree pronounced the penalty of banishment against "ecclesiastics who alarmed consciences." Mgr. Chica, the archbishop of Quito, announced to the government: "Come what may, I shall continue to resist the propagation of error. Such is my duty, and with the grace of God I shall be faithful to it." Fifteen days after this protest, on Good Friday, March 30, the archbishop officiated at the Mass of the Presanctified in the cathedral. He had scarcely taken the wine of ablution when he was attacked by horrible convulsions, and died within an hour. The autopsy showed that twelve grains of strychnine had been given to the prelate. Of course the assassins were never punished. The remains of the archbishop had scarcely been placed in the tomb, when Vintimilla ordered all the pastors in the republic to celebrate, on April 19th, Masses of Requiem for the souls of "all the *martyrs of holy Liberalism* who had fallen since March 19, 1869"—this date being that of a famous insurrection against Moreno. To this decree the bishops opposed an order forbidding "a scandal to the Catholic people;" and as nearly all the Equadorians applauded the action of the prelates, the dictator perforce contented himself with an oath of revenge. In quick succession came a revocation of the Concordat which had guaranteed the liberty of the Catholic religion, a suppression of all the ecclesiastical salaries, and the exile of many pastors. The bishop of Guayaquil died with all the symptoms of poisoning, and the bishop of Riobamba escaped assassination by fleeing to the mountains. The people of Equador were on the verge of revolution, when Vintimilla resolved to change his policy. The exiled priests were recalled, and the bishops were made to understand that the government desired peace. This "treachery" on the part of their creature enraged the Masons; the Catholics could not rely on the sincerity of their recent enemy; and in

1883 a revolution, in which both Liberals and Conservatives took part, overthrew Vintimilla. From that time until the Masonic eruption under Alfaro, the sequels of which still persevere in the form of nearly every conceivable kind of persecution of the Church, the Brethren of the Three Points allowed Equador to rest in comparative peace.

The sad distinction of having succumbed, perhaps pusillanimously, to Masonic machinations more frequently than the other South American Republics, belongs to Brazil and Equador. But in all the other states the Church has found, at least in our day, much reason for sorrow. In Argentina the Government asked the Holy See, in 1875, to send some missionaries and some female religious who would labor in the outlying regions of the republic, where there was a dearth of spiritual and civilizing agencies. Pius IX. immediately arranged with the superiors of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales, the now wide-spread society which had been founded in Turin by Don Bosco, for the departure of ten Salesians for the promising field; and he ordered twelve Sisters of the Congregation of Our Lady *della Misericordia*, the mother-establishment of which is in Savona, to set out for the same destination. In the audience of farewell which His Holiness accorded to the little band, he necessarily reflected on the iniquities recently perpetrated by Masonry in countries which were sisters to Argentina, and in order to encourage the new apostles, he said: "This time I am not sending lambs to a pack of wolves. You are going to a country where the authorities are favorable to you, and God will fructify your labors." But scarcely had the Salesians and their auxiliaries landed in Argentina, when they learned that the Masons, enraged because of a failure to induce the Congress to enter on a course of Satanic enterprise in regard to Catholicism, had incited the populace of Buenos Ayres to an anti-Jesuitical riot, massacred several of the Jesuit professors who were instructing the Argentine youth in the sciences apparently dear to the Masonic heart, and levelled the college to the ground. Nor did Chili—hitherto, perhaps, the most pronouncedly Catholic state in Latin America—escape the contagion. In 1875 the Grand Lodge of Chili, ruled by English and German merchants and speculators, drew up a plan for the "complete secularization"—that is, for the atheization—of the social institutions of the republic. This scheme, entitled a "Plan of Work for the Grand Lodge of Chili," was published by that excellent Masonic authority to which we are indebted for so much of our knowledge concerning the enterprises of the Brethren, namely, the "Monde

Maçonnique," in its issue of January, 1876. In the third Article of this plan it is ordered that: "The Section for Instruction shall attend to: 1st, the foundation of secular schools; 2d, to the furnishing of aid to every society (especially the Protestant *colporteurs*) which gives gratuitous instruction to the poor (that is, which tries to deprive the poor of their faith); 3d, to contribute to the prosperity of all the scientific, literary and artistic institutions in the country (provided that there were any which were not Catholic); 4th, to give popular conferences for the spread of such knowledge as tends to facilitate the progress of humanity." The Section for Benevolence was to occupy itself: 1st, with the foundation of hospitals (as though Chili needed hospitals); 2d, with aiding directly or indirectly all such institutions *when they do not pursue egoistic and sectarian objects* (that is, when they are not Catholic)." . . . . The Section for Propaganda was to: "1st, defend and make known the veritable sentiments of Freemasonry (then why not abolish "the secret"?); 2d, to try to introduce into all public institutions the principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity; and especially to labor for a separation of Church and state, *for the establishment of Civil Marriage*,[1] for the abolition

[1] Civil marriage, with its necessary consequence of divorce *ad libitum* and the ultimate destruction of the very idea of the family, is ever one of the dearest objects to the Masonic heart. Voltaire, Helvetius, d'Alembert, Rouillé d'Orfeuil and all *ejusdem furfuris* insisted upon the destruction of every trace of a sacramental idea in matrimony, and the Constituent Assembly of 1790 actuated this theory when it proclaimed the equality of bastards and legitimate children. In this Assembly Cambacérès, the future arch-chancellor of Napoleon and future Grand Master of French Masonry, declared: "There is a law which is superior to all others, and that law—the law of nature—tells us that illegitimate children have all the rights which some would take from them. . . . . All children, without any distinction, have the right of succession to those who have given existence to them. The differences heretofore subsisting between these classes of children are merely effects of pride and superstition, and they are ignominious and contrary to justice." During the rule of the Paris Commune of 1871, as we learn from Maxime du Camp, in his *Convulsions of Paris*, the Central Council applauded the Citizen Gratien when, at a reunion in the Hotel de Ville, he thus perorated: "If we wish to give to all an equal and a revolutionary education, we must destroy the family. The child is not a property of a father and mother; the child belongs to the State." Ragon, whose *Interpretative Course* was approved by the Grand Orient of France in 1840 as "the work of a profoundly instructed brother," says: "The indissolubility of marriage is contrary to the laws of nature and of reason. . . . . Its corrective is divorce; divorce is now among our customs, waiting for the day when it will be found among our laws." Louis Napoleon, in his *Napoleonic Ideas*, when recounting the mistakes of the French governments that preceded his own, numbered as one of those errors their failure to admit the right of divorce in their jurisprudence. Since such are the sentiments of Masonry in regard to marriage and the family, we were not surprised when we read in the *Official Municipal Bulletin of Paris* of September, 1882, that on the preceding August 12th, at a distribution of prizes to the schools of the Fourteenth Arondissement, Brother Schmidt, an assistant to the mayor, told the young girls that it was the duty of French mothers "to make their children hate that

of all privileges, for the *secularization of all charities* (so as to provide fat salaries for the distributors, attendants, etc.); 3d, for the help of all victims of *religious intolerance*." In spite of the efforts of the English and German residents in Chili, this Masonic programme failed; but in 1881 the Masonic "Chaine d'Union" (p. 437) encouraged the Brethren with this information: "Brother Jose Vergara, Minister of the Interior, has been chosen Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Chili. We cannot doubt that, under the direction of this eminent Brother, the Chilian Lodges will recover all their activity, which is now so repressed by the clerical party. In Chili it is really the English and German Lodges that do the work." Nevertheless, hitherto the sterling Catholicism of the Chilian people has refused to accept the enlightenment which emanates from the rays of the Dark Lantern.

Venezuela has held its own fairly well in face of Masonic aggression, although during the three presidential terms of Guzman Blanco (1873–1887) the Brethren continually flattered themselves that Venezuelan Catholicism was moribund, thanks to the poison which the Liberalism of Blanco, the "Protector of the Masonic Order in the Republic," allowed them to administer to the people. Under date of March 29, 1874, the Grand Lodge of Venezuela sent "to all the Lodges in its jurisdiction" a circular, the barefaced mendacity of which has rarely been excelled in any of the documents which, after the dagger, have ever been the chosen weapons of South American Masonry in its campaigns of "popular instruction." We shall quote a few gems from this official pronouncement. "Having been called to regenerate Venezuela, and being filled with faith in the principles of Masonry, Brother Guzman Blanco has resolved to take the Masonry of Venezuela as his co-operatrix, and he presents himself as its declared and decided protector. . . . . The Grand Lodge regards as enemies of Masonry all who make war on Masonic associations; all who do not respect the dignity of the country; all who try to suffocate the reason of man; all who try to dominate by means of ignorance; *all who foment fanaticism and superstition*. . . . . Masonry holds that truth rests on science, and on science alone; Masonry repels absolutely all fanaticism and superstition, warring on them inexorably by means of instruction. . . . . He is not a

---

religious cosmopolitanism which debases our earthly country beneath a hypothetical religion which is hidden somewhere in the vault of heaven," and that children should be taught to despise "that humility which impels a man to kneel before another who is no more infallible than himself."

true Freemason who does not support the government which represents the people of Venezuela in the combat *against the pretensions of the Vatican to a sovereignty on Venetian soil*—a sovereignty which would be superior to that of the Venezuelans themselves. The question is as to whether Venezuela is bound to receive the inspirations of the Vatican—of that power which recently *ordered its representative in Paris to see that in all the churches of France prayers were addressed to the Supreme Being for the ruin of the Republic* and the restoration of the Monarchy; of that power which has always insisted on ignorance as the principal support of the Holy See and of all thrones. . . . . *You perceive how detrimental to all its servants this influence of the Vatican must be, since it leads them to the most criminal perjury.* . . . . *The great majority of Freemasons are faithful Christians*, fulfilling all the duties which the Church imposes on them, *although they do not renounce the exercise of their reason*, since that reason is sacred to them, being an emanation from the Supreme Being. . . . . *During many centuries the Church of Rome prevented the diffusion of knowledge*, and punished as heretics all who penetrated the secrets of nature, and revealed those secrets to other men. *During many centuries the Church of Rome denounced the education of the masses* as prejudicial to both ecclesiastical and civil tyranny; and the Holy See appealed to all sovereigns, in the name of their own existence, to combat liberal principles. . . . . Against this injustice Masonry has fought from the first days of its existence, and the hour has now struck for all our Brethren to work for the manifestation of truth in its entirety." With the President of the Republic (we should say, its *dictator*) as the gracious Protector of Venezuelan Masonry, it is not strange that the Venezuelan people were afflicted, during the entire period of their suffering under the incubus of Guzman Blanco, with laws which "manifested (Masonic travesty of) truth in its entirety"; and that the usual Masonic persecution of the clergy became the order of the day. Only one of the Venezuelan bishops was derelict. Mgr. Guebara, archbishop of Caracas, having refused to swear fidelity to the Masonico-Febronian enactments, was exiled, and his see was offered to the bishop of Guayana, an aged, weak, but ambitious prelate, who signified his willingness to commit spiritual bigamy. Pope Pius IX., under date of July 8, 1874, wrote to the unfortunate man a strong but fatherly reproof, dwelling on the wickedness of the new laws to which the bishop of Guayana had sworn fidelity, and stigmatizing the hypocrisy with which the weakling had assured the

Holy See that "he would have liked to refuse the archiepiscopal dignity on account of his age and feebleness."[1]

Peru has suffered much anxiety because of the intrigues of Masonry, supported by the funds at the disposal of the so-called "missionary" bodies which are so plentifully endowed by gullible Protestants in the United States; but of open persecution Peru has experienced but little. During the first years of the pontificate of Pius IX. the Masons endeavored to incite a war with the Holy See on the subject of episcopal and parochial appointments; but the Pontiff checkmated the Brethren by according to the presidents of Peru the right of patronage which his predecessors had granted, in the olden time, to the kings of Spain.[2] Hitherto the exercise of this right of patronage seems

[1] "One fact modifies our grief," said the Pontiff; "you have not yet usurped the diocese of another bishop; you have caused a great scandal, but you have not yet become formally an intruder. You remind us that you are an old man. Think, therefore, of the judgment which you must soon undergo. What will you reply to Jesus Christ, when He demands an account of your stewardship and upbraids you for having rended His seamless garment? . . . . Dignities, wealth, the favor of the powerful, form a vain paraphernalia which will soon be taken from you; reflect on the punishment that awaits you, if you persist in preparing the way for schism and apostasy. . . . . Hasten, venerable brother, by a public and immediate retraction of your wicked oath, to remove the stumbling-block of scandal which you have placed in the path of the faithful; hasten to redeem your lamentable weakness by an apostolic firmness of soul and by an intrepid defense of the rights of the Church."

[2] Pius, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, for the imperishable remembrance of this matter: Among the singular favors which God has conferred on the Peruvian nation, none is so striking as the gift of Catholic truth which the Peruvians have carefully preserved from the day when they first received it from the preachers of the Gospel, and which they have cultivated so well that from among them have risen several heroes whom the Church has regarded as worthy of the honors of her altars. . . . . To this zeal in preserving Catholic unity have been added many other acts performed by the governmental authority. Thus the endowments of dioceses already existing have been liberally augmented, and those of new dioceses have been readily accorded; aid has been given to the seminaries, and to the colleges which missionaries have founded for the propagation of the faith; similar generosity has been exhibited in providing for the diffusion of sound doctrine by the endowment of parishes among those (savages) who have been converted to the faith; and, finally, considerable sums have been expended in the restoration and ornamentation of old churches and in the erection of new ones. . . . . Wherefore, wishing to condescend to the prayers which the Peruvian government has addressed to us through its representative, and following the example of our predecessors who have ever granted special favors to those who have deserved well of Christendom, we have resolved, after consultation with certain cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, to concede by our Apostolic authority that hereafter the President of the Republic of Peru, and his successors, shall enjoy that right of patronage which, by the favor of the Apostolic See, the Kings of Spain enjoyed in Peru before that country was separated from the rule of the Spanish crown. . . . . The President of the Republic of Peru, and his successors, shall enjoy the right of presenting to the Apostolic See, whenever an archiepiscopal or episcopal see is vacant, the names of certain fit and worthy ecclesiastics; so that, according to the regulations prescribed by the Holy Canons, the canonical institution may be effected. . . . . Nevertheless, the candidates thus presented shall enjoy no

to have prevented any extraordinary manifestations, on the part of the Peruvian government, of greed for ecclesiastical property, or of jealousy of ecclesiastical privileges.

At the present moment, no country of Latin America is so subjected to the nefarious influence of Masonry as is our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico. In 1867, the "Freemason's Journal" of Leipsic published a correspondence from this sectary-ridden land, which ascribed to the votaries of the Dark Lantern the "credit" of all the revolutions which have cursed the country ever since the "yoke" of Spain was discarded.[1] The Masonic writer, in fact, gave a mere paraphrase of the report "On the Form of Government which Mexico Ought to Adopt," which was accepted by the Assembly of Notables which undertook, in 1863, to give to their country some semblance of a stable and Christian government.[2] Whatever may be our opinion concerning French intervention in the affairs of Mexico, or concerning the weak scion of the Hapsburgs who vacillated between the conservatives and the "liberals" until resolution was of no use, who condescended to humor Masonry by signing a Concordat which the Holy See was obliged to condemn,—it is certain that the Assembly of Notables represented all that was respectable in Mexico, both for morality and for education. The solemn utterances of such a body, spoken in the face of expectant America and Europe, are worthy of attention. Alluding to the separation from the mother country, the notables insisted that if, at that time, "Mexico had not forgotten her ancient institutions, undoubtedly she would have reached the height of prosperity; but she knew not how to profit by her emancipation, and she abused her independence." The Federal Constitution, "an imperfect imitation of that of the United States," contended the notables, "proved to be the ruin of Mexico"; but the evil was increased and confirmed "by the establishment of Masonic Lodges"—those of the Scotch Rite and of the Rite of York. "These secret societies, by their conspiracies, and by means of poison and the dagger, decided the

---

right of episcopal administration, until they shall have received the Apostolic Letters conferring their institution. . . . . The said President shall also enjoy the right of presentation to canonicates *de officio*, and to parishes, providing that the canonical regulations concerning *concursus* and examination shall have been observed. . . . . Finally, the Presidents of Peru shall receive, in all the churches of the Republic, the same honors which were formerly accorded to the Kings of Spain, because of the right of patronage which was granted by this Holy See. . . . . Given at Rome, near St. Peter's, on the Third of the Nones of March, 1874; the Twenty-ninth Year of our Pontificate."

[1] This correspondence was reproduced in *Le Monde* of July 14, 1867.

[2] This report was published in the Paris *Moniteur* of Sept. 13, 1863.

destiny of the country, and played with the lives of the citizens." It was because of the inspiration of the Lodges, declared the notables, that in 1828 the city of Mexico beheld the governmental authorities supervising the pillage of the Grand Bazaar, sanctioning attacks against private property. "From the Lodges came the iniquitous laws of banishment decreed against all persons of Spanish birth"; laws which affected so many innocent persons, which destroyed commerce by banishing capital, and which ended in the public sale of exemptions from the decree of exile. "The highest positions in the republic are frequently occupied by common highwaymen. The public treasury is constantly depleted. The property of the Church is wickedly confiscated, and with no profit to the country." With the fall of Maximilian came dark days indeed for the Catholics of Mexico; but not until November 24, 1874, was the "Separation of Church and State" effected in a manner which was calculated to satisfy Masonry while it waits for the moment when it will be able, as it fondly trusts, to sweep from Mexican soil the last trace of Catholicism. By the new law, which has hitherto been inexorably enforced, no officer of the government (civil or military), no body of troops, no corporation of any kind, can assist officially at any religious service. No holidays, save the purely civil, are recognized by the State, but "Sunday may be observed as a day of rest from labor." All religious instruction and all acts of religious worship are prohibited in every establishment of the State. "No act of worship or of a religious nature can be performed outside of the churches, under pain of a fine of from 10 to 200 piastres, or of imprisonment for from two to fifteen days. A fine of from 100 to 200 piastres is incurred by an ecclesiastic every time that he appears in public (outside a church) in an ecclesiastical dress, or with any insignia of his office. All services in the churches are to be constantly under the eyes of the police." No religious institution can acquire real estate or capital which is derived from real estate. By the nineteenth article of this law even the Sisters of Charity were attacked. They were forbidden to wear any distinctive costume, or to live in community. The matter of dress might have been arranged, but the prohibition of "community life" was equivalent to a sentence of banishment. Four hundred of the daughters of St. Vincent de Paul sought refuge in France.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

## BISMARCK'S DECLINE AND FALL.

WE are reminded by the peevish exclusiveness of Bismarck's epitaph, as written by himself, of a dog story familiar in childhood's day. "Touch me not: I belong to Cæsar," was the inscription on the collar of a pet of the great man which warned off all intending dog-stealers. "The faithful German servant of the Emperor William I." is Bismarck's description of himself. With Emperor William II. he will have no connection, even in death. A good deal of the mastiff, too, is discernible in the grim lines of that old face with its heavy brows and mustache, and a good deal of the mastiff's ferocity and tenacity. "A faithful German servant" may be freely translated in quite the opposite way. The faithful servant who was able to lead the master whithersoever he willed—a servant only by a fiction, a master in reality.

Whatever sentiments the career of Bismarck as a public force may inspire, it is impossible to look upon his years of banishment from office without some feeling of pity. We now learn, from the disclosures made after his death, how poignantly he felt the blow inflicted by the Emperor's hand in the acceptance of his resignation. It amounted virtually to a dismissal. As Bismarck was the man who made the Empire, the tragic irony of the climax became all the more sharp and fit. The height of cynical repayment is here beheld; Nemesis justifies her place among the Fates.

Prometheus chained to the rock, with the vulture tearing at his vitals, was an allegory surely invented to typify such a case as the dismissal of Bismarck and the moral effect of the ingratitude upon a despotic spirit accustomed to overbear and to rule all things according to his own standard of right and wrong.

During the old Emperor's time, we now find, Bismarck was the Mayor of the Palace, and the other a veritable *roi fainéant.* We find from Dr. Busch's testimony that Bismarck was so daring that he could browbeat the old monarch into making war against his will and his judgment. He even had the unbridled audacity to mangle the King's telegrams so as to make it appear he was provoking the war, while in reality the deluded potentate was doing what he could to avert hostilities. When we behold a man who had for many years wielded power so unusual, so tremendous, as this, cast out of office and fuming his tempestuous soul away in petty domestic cares, we can almost sympathize with his demigod

bitterness of soul. The serpent's tooth must have rankled even to the marrow. Bismarck did not pretend either to forgive or to forget. In the servile-seeming epitaph for Friedrichsruhe he has left a perpetual memorial of his implacable resentment and sense of wrong. The end was characteristic of the man. He had become the Tymon of politics, and he died with a Tymon-like imprecation upon those whom he despised, as we may fairly interpret it.

While the contemplation of Bismarck's personality must long prove an interesting employment for the student, to the Catholic scholar it is especially valuable as a means of tracing out the singular agencies through which the Divine wisdom operates for the probation and triumph of the Church. Bismarck was an anomaly and an anachronism. He fetches us back from the nineteenth century to the sixteenth, by his policy, his speech, and his tremendous action. He united in himself the fury of a Peter the Great and the profound duplicity of a Machiavelli, in his attempt to beat down the Church, and he lived to find that as easily might he hack the intrenchant air. The negative results of his policy were vastly more momentous in the spiritual world than the positive ones in the political. While he succeeded in building up and solidifying a mighty temporal empire, he set in motion an immense centripetal moral force under whose influence the scattered and objectless factors of Catholicism in Germany coalesced and harmonized so as to form an unassailable rampart for the Church, in the one aspect, and a powerful fortress for civil liberty in another. As in the physical order we find the cataclysm and the convulsion of nature working out the constructive purposes hidden from our gaze, so in the moral dispensation forces seemingly inimical and overturning make for advancement and perfection. How admirable, then, the ways of the Divine Architect—how baffling to all mere human judgment and wisdom!

Bismarck was no lover of the people, and herein we may get a clue to his otherwise unintelligible action against the Church. Taking him dispassionately, we do not find those elements in his disposition which ordinarily mark the bigot. Statesmen of his rank and mental stature are above the littleness of bigotry. They may utilize bigots as instruments and materials to work upon in the development of their policy, but in religious creeds they are usually lax and tolerant. Richelieu as a politician, apart from his personality as a Churchman, may be cited as a good case in point. Bismarck's *bête noir* in his domestic policy was the Social movement. He saw he could not put it down with the strong

hand; hence, as the lion's skin was short, he tried the fox's, like Richelieu in the play. He coquetted with Socialism, took up the theories of Lassalle, and endeavored to formulate a tentative scheme of "State Socialism"; and Mr. Chamberlain in England rendered him the flattery of imitation in his famous proposal for old-age pensions. His contempt for the democracy was as deep as his contempt for the press, yet he stooped to cajole the one and to bribe the other. He had a successful rival in the Church, whose old social system had struck its roots so deep in Germany that it became an easy matter to extend and strengthen them when the time came to make this the gage of battle. In that Socialism which springs from infidelity the Church sees a danger to be dreaded as devoutly as Bismarck and his master dreaded it, but not to be answered or turned aside in the way these bunglers attempted. Its method is love and wisdom; theirs, hate and folly. Modern history fails to furnish any example of State weapons being so dramatically turned against the hands that forged them as in this double movement of Bismarck against the Church and the Social movement. There is complete poetical justice in the *denouement* of the drama. The Church has emerged stronger than she has ever been in Germany, as far as what may be termed political solidarity is concerned, and her social organization, which was only inchoate or sporadic when the struggle began, is now an all-pervading beneficial influence, moral, intellectual and industrial, without parallel for extent and spirit in any other portion of the globe. Of this, something will be appropriate later on. What is to be considered immediately is the apparently accidental character of the circumstances which aroused the latent genius and resources of German Catholicism, and developed and strengthened a spirit of resistance to oppression, and made that spirit a force for public freedom for the whole people, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, which is the wonder of outside spectators as well as the despair of unconstitutional rulers.

Side by side with the star of Bismarck's success there traveled that of another leader no less puissant in statesmanship of a different purpose than the welder of German imperialism. This man, Louis Joseph Ferdinand Windthorst, whose birth preceded Bismarck's by only three years, seemed to have been raised up by Divine Providence to thwart and defeat the far-reaching malice and ambition of this new master of many legions. Like Bismarck, his parentage was connected with the feudal aristocracy, but, unlike Bismarck, his physical mould was not such as to inspire awe or admiration, but rather ridicule. He was almost a dwarf, and

his features were what many called ugly; and an enormous head added a grotesque element to the malproportion of his figure. But that head was freighted with brains, and the heart which beat within that distorted frame was always throbbing with the courage of a paladin, the tenderness of a woman, and the devotion of an old saint. A spirit of irrepressible mirth and drollery had been likewise bestowed upon him by kindly Nature, as a charm against the melancholy which so often characterizes the race of Quasimodo, of whom Windthorst might almost be said to be one. It looks paradoxical, but it is true, that this very "ordinary" mortal possessed a fascination of manner quite as irresistible as though he were an Apollo. This is the subtle influence which springs from a heart that is fearless, noble, and conscious of the right. A friend of his, a Berlin Jew, one August Stern, thus sketches the man, exteriorly and inwardly: "He who has never seen Windthorst laugh, nor followed the mirth growing from the smile on his broad mouth to the outburst of jovial appreciation in his hearty laugh, can form no idea of the power of expression in his mobile features. His pictures give no idea of the kind and humorous man whose expressive features cannot be copied in the staid pose of a portrait."

Nor was his formidable adversary, Bismarck, in his more gentle moods, deficient in this quality of geniality or the mysterious sort of odic force which often springs from it. But there was this difference between the two men: Bismarck could dissemble. He could wear a mask of cordiality and bluff good-nature whenever it was politic. As the wife of the Thane of Cawdor advised, he could "look like the smiling flower, but be the serpent under it." But not so with Windthorst. He was too honest a man for dissimulation. He had no mask of state to wear, no powerful enemies to cajole, when he could not bully, into accepting his friendship. His art is well described by the eminent Continental *litterateur*, or contemporary historian, rather M. de Blowitz, for whom Prince Bismarck sent during the Berlin Congress of 1878, in order to secure his services in "squaring" the London "Times" over the Batoum question. He writes of the incident—a very extraordinary one, indeed, in the annals of statecraft—in these terms:

"This man whom fame immeasuredly extolled is one of the few whom I then found equal to and above their reputation. He struck me with profound admiration by the terrible simplicity of the means employed by him for carrying on diplomacy after his own fashion. Dinner was immediately served, and even before we had seated ourselves, turning to me, he said: 'I am glad to see you, and I hope that, with the help of the

"Times," we shall be able to smooth over this Batoum question which threatens to disturb the work of the Congress.' Once seated at table and placing me on his right, he gave me the never-to-be-forgotten spectacle of the fascination which a man can exercise when bent on winning over anybody to whom he attaches some interest or importance. This assumed quite the proportions of an art, and I did not even attempt to resist it. He told me simply what he thought should be made known to England and Europe. He explained to me that the English plenipotentiaries had to prepare the country for the concessions imposed on it by their desire for peace, and he asked with admirably feigned modesty, in what shape I thought proper to give the reflections which he had just communicated. Then, satisfied with my answer, he dropped Batoum as a settled question and set himself to charm and seduce his auditor.

"Never have I seen such a Jupiter changing himself into a gentle rain, so formidable a personage assuming a tone of graciousness and charm. At a certain moment he turned to me and said, 'Perhaps you would like a glass of beer? My old Munich friend brews it expressly for me'; and he poured me out a glass. I began laughing, and he asked the reason. 'Because in my childhood a kind of lunatic said to me, 'Thou wilt rise in the world and princes will offer thee drink,' and behold his prophecy is fulfilled in a glass of beer.' The Prince assumed a serious air. 'Well,' he said, 'it is a true prophecy, for I do not offer drink to everybody,' and pouring out a second glass he said, 'It is better to fulfill the prediction twice over.'"

It was by exhibitions of this kind, M. de Blowitz adds thoughtfully, that the great Chancellor prepared himself for the war with France by worming himself into the good graces of Benedetti, the French ambassador; and the secret history of that proceeding, as unfolded in the pages of Dr. Busch, the Chancellor's Boswell, shows a more revolting process of trickery and misrepresentation than ever was dreamed of by Machiavelli. But this is more the concern of the historian and the statesman than the moralist; we are chiefly interested in the motives and the results of that memorable struggle known as the *Kulturkampf*, because of the vastness of the conflict and the completeness of the victory of the arm of the spirit over that of the flesh.

Two Bismarcks are now being put before the world. One is sketched by such pens as that of the editor of the "Review of Reviews," in whose sight the departed statesman was a sort of terrible demigod, like one of the great mythical figures of the Nibelungen legend. Mr. Stead's "appreciation" may be epitomized in a couple of his own perfervid sentences:

"Despite all his opportunist ways, he kept the testimony of a good conscience—of a sort, and stuck to his post to the last. It was not with his own good will that he was compelled to hand over the duty of steering the ship of State to the Kaiser, William the Second. This faith of his in his providential mission, however little foundation others may believe it to possess, unquestionably gave steadiness to his purpose and a ruthless edge to his resolution. If, as he once phrased it, he did 'not despair that God in His mercy would not take away from me the staff of humble faith with which I seek my way amid the doubts and dangers of my position,' it is to be feared that those who stood in his way found that 'staff of humble faith' used about their shoulders as if it were the quarter-staff of Friar Tuck. For Prince Bismarck was a Christian of the

Church Militant, a Christian crossed with a Berserker, whose dominant note resembled the war songs of Valhalla rather than the seraphic melody of the Sermon on the Mount. M. Thiers declared he was a barbarian of the type of Atilla or Genseric. He was a Prussian Junker but half-baptized; a disciple of Thor of the Thunder Hammer, rather than of the Pale Galilean."

These enthusiastic limnings have been imitated in a greater or less degree of warmth by sundry writers in the non-Catholic religious press who have been completely captivated by Bismarck's "confession of faith" in the style of Captain Philip, of the battleship Texas—a confession which, *par parenthèse*, might have been made by Shelley, or Hume, or any deist who ever rejected the tenets of Christianity. This "confession" is recorded by his private secretary, Dr. Busch, whose recently published book has produced spasms of horror among Bismarck's admirers and certain circles in diplomacy wherein the belief seems to be held that something of the mystery of the Grand Llama should surround the life of a statesman. In Dr. Busch's diary the acknowledgment appears in this form:

"'His God and his King' were ever in Bismarck's thoughts. 'If I were no longer a Christian I would not serve the King another hour,' he said. Continuing in the same vein, he added these words:

"'If I did not put my trust in God I should certainly place none in any earthly masters. Why, I had quite enough to live on, and had a sufficiently distinguished position. Why should I labor and toil unceasingly in this world and expose myself to worry and vexation if I did not feel that I must do my duty toward God? If I did not believe in a Divine Providence which has ordained this German nation to something good and great, I would at once give up my trade as a statesman or I should never have gone into the business. Orders and titles have no attraction for me. A resolute faith in a life after death—for that reason I am a royalist; otherwise I am by nature a republican.'"

If we contrast this effusive declaration with very many of the acts of the man who made it, as recorded by the same faithful and servile pen, our wonder grows deeper and deeper how easily a man may impose upon himself. A belief in God held concurrently with an absolute disregard of the most elementary morality in all dealings with other persons is one of those psychical phenomena which are as mysterious and inexplicable as the obscurest problems of hypnotism. No perfidy could be greater than that by which the war with France was brought about against the will of the old king, William. It is the blackest chapter in European history since Machiavellianism became the guiding principle in European statecraft. The moral sense which could sanction such sanguinary duplicity found no difficulty in railing at what its possessor styled a "reptile press," and being itself the chief figure in the creation of such an execrable institution. Dr. Busch relates at consider-

able length the part which Bismarck took in getting up a scare about a danger to European peace over the Battenberg marriage question, and how he got him to write an article for the "Grenzboten" on the subject, and how, after it was published, Bismarck himself inspired an article in the "Borsenzeitung" declaring that he was most indignant at the appearance of such an article, because of the attacks it made upon the Empress Victoria—the one woman who seemed to understand and not to fear the unscrupulous bully of Friedrichsruhe. To find the man who was guilty of such shocking profligacy prating about belief in God so elaborately and insistently makes one shudder. It reminds us of the piety of Cromwell's hordes, whose oft-drenched sword-blades usually bore choice texts of Scripture for mottoes of massacre.

Bismarck was fond of apothegms; he loved them so much that he became renowned as the maker of some. One of his best beloved ones was: "The freedom of the Church means the rule of the Church." Like Napoleon, he believed that the only proper use for the Church was as a department of the State; and his ideal bishop was a sort of Prussian grenadier or heavy dragoon with a cassock over his jack-boots. He persuaded himself that he believed in religion, but he himself was the authority to prescribe the kind and degree that were to be administered by the State. "A certain amount of positive Christianity," he said, "is necessary for the ordinary man, if he is not to become dangerous to human society." Regarding what other people believed, as we have said, Bismarck was no bigot. He was simply a man who hated the democracy and aimed at substituting Prussian militarism for the constitutional, moral and religious law of the various States of which the present German Empire is composed. Toward the end of his life he affected a certain degree of piety or reverence for Biblical religion; but he was then in retirement, and in a sense like Job on his dunghill with his enemies exulting over his misfortunes. He had felt how sharp was the serpent's tooth of royal ingratitude; he was sick in body and spirit; like Macbeth he had begun to weary of the sun, and he took to religious consolation in the same reluctant way as he took to the advice of his doctor. How different the closing days of this saturnine old courtier from those of the manful constitutionalist, Windthorst! He died in harness, it might be said almost literally, for he was in the midst of his parliamentary duties, fighting the battles of the people against the coercive policy of the Empire, when he was stricken down. It was on the 9th of March, 1891. He was seized with a fever, which was attended with delirium. Yet, all through, his mind was

busy with his life-work, and in his delirium he made eloquent appeals on the Christian school question, the return of the Jesuits to Germany, and kindred topics. His daughter was sent for, and during his occasional moments of consciousness he took leave of her, sent messages of love and resignation to his wife, who was too ill to travel from Hanover, and received the last sacraments of the Church.

Could we find anywhere, in all modern or ancient record, any example more eloquent of the greater happiness of the man who serves his conscience rather than an earthly prince? Had it been possible for the two men to change places in their latter days, Windthorst, the deposed minister, would have shown a very different spectacle from Bismarck the toothless lion. He would have his religion to support him, with the consciousness of duty done without wrong to any man; and he would not be found troubling the world with petulant complaints or garrulously prating of the secrets of his royal master, as Bismarck was never tired of doing in those frequent days when gout, combined with a poignant sense of wrong, had stung him into paroxysms of savage moroseness.

Yet these two men, widely sundered as they were in every mental and physical characteristic, were destined to play a part to some extent analogous and co-equal in the development of Teutonic civilization. While to the one was given the task of unifying the German Empire in a material sense, to the other fell the higher part of unifying its scattered Catholic forces and welding them into an impregnable barrier for both religious and political freedom. "The Reformation," says Emilio Castelar, with curious infelicity, in a recent paper, "gave Prussia freedom of thought." The result of this singular sort of emancipation was, as we all know, the letting loose of the most fantastic floods of metaphysics that ever perplexed the minds of mortals, concurrently with theories of military absolutism and bureaucratic rule that, as a reaction, produced Socialistic dreams and combinations which threatened dismal internal convulsion. We have seen how, in the early days of Socialism, Bismarck was struck with the principles and propositions of Lassalle, not so much through any especial philanthropy of his own nature as because his sagacity enabled him to foresee what influence such ideas were likely to exercise on the great game of life which lay before him. We find him adopting Lassalle's theories to a modified extent, and propounding them tentatively under the name of State Socialism, but we find him also making the country too warm for Karl Marx when that unfortunate demagogue attempted to secure the adoption of the Socialistic principle

without the hall-mark of the State. The trouble with the Socialists in Germany was scarcely less difficult to deal with, to Bismarck, than the trouble in France with the new revolution personified in Victor Noir ; and when we seek for the secret sources of the great war of 1870–71 we find somewhat similar currents of domestic perturbation sought to be diverted into long closed-up channels by the two astute and unscrupulous men then controlling the destinies of the European continent. Windthorst and the faithful friends who acted with him were no less keen to read the signs of the times, but infinitely more sagacious in applying them to the living opportunities of the hour. Socialism they knew to be only a new name for a form of civilization to which the German people had long been accustomed as the practical application of Christianity to the problem of material life. It had flourished in the feudal ages, and brought peace and prosperity to all the Empire, until the sinister advent of the "Reformation," which shattered all the bonds of kindly intercourse between classes and communities, and substituted the principle of individual selfishness as the complement to the right of private judgment. This Socialism differed from the Socialism of the new theorists in that it had its springs in the spirit of charity and fraternalism, while the other was a cold philosophic or economic panacea for incurable ills, standing in much the same relation to true benevolence as the British workhouse system does to the divine attribute of charity. It was a singular coincidence that the great achievement of Bismarck, the federation of the German States and the formation from them of the German Empire, the master-stroke which was to obliterate all things old and set up the entirely new—was the very means by which this long-dormant spirit of fraternity was destined to be revived. When Bismarck returned triumphant from the pageantry at Versailles he found that the new policy had produced a new party. This party was called the Centre party, and it was known it was also a Catholic party. The object of the combination was to guard the several members of the new Empire against oppression by the dominant State of the federation. The principal "planks" of its programme were thus set forth in a manifesto issued in March, 1871, and signed by Herr Windthorst, Prince Löwenstein, Dr. Reichensperger, Von Malinckrodt, Von Savigny, and Herr Freytag :

"1st. That the fundamental character of the Empire as a State confederacy shall be known by its efforts to change the federal character of the imperial constitution, and by not interfering with the decisions and activity of the individual States in all interior matters any more than is necessary for the interest of the whole.

"2d. That the moral and material good of the masses should be furthered, that the civil and religious freedom of the subjects, especially of religious bodies, be continuously protected from legislative greed."

Bismarck at once saw the drift of these resolutions, and saw, at the same time, as he thought, the means of thwarting their aim. Hanover had resisted his consolidation policy, and Hanover had been crushed in the Austrian struggle and forced to bend to his will. Windthorst had, as Minister of Justice in Hanover, been his most formidable opponent, and here he was now, under Bismarck's own arrangement of an imperial parliament, leading the scattered forces of opposition against his darling policy. In his mad student days he had crossed swords in the duelling field, according to the German usage, with Windthorst; a combat of a sterner character had to be undertaken now. The dogma of Papal Infallibility had been enounced, and a bitter logomachy, led by Mr. Gladstone, was raging over it; the times were as propitious as in the poisoning scene in "Hamlet":

"Thoughts black, hands apt, drugs fit, and time agreeing."

He affected to see in this new party a grave menace to the safety of the new Empire. He began by an attack upon Windthorst's loyalty. In the Prussian House of Deputies, where Herr Windthorst sat as member for Meppen, he said, in January, 1872:

"In this house I contemplate the most extraordinary spectacle. A sectarian faction setting itself up as a political party; a party which, should all other sects accept its principles, must be confronted as an evangelical body. This would lead us into a tortuous path, for theology would necessarily be introduced into our debates. It was a great mistake of policy, perpetrated by these gentlemen, to build a political party on sectarian foundations, for they draw their co-religionists from the various parties through the subtle influence at their command. On my return from France I could only look on this party as a factor decidedly opposed to the State, and I asked myself, 'Will this mutinous body be true to the government—will it aid it or oppose it?' My fears increased when I saw at its head so argumentative and aggressive a member as the deputy from Meppen. Gentlemen of the Centre, you would have shown yourselves more in sympathy with the State had you chosen some other than your Guelphic leader and had you not admitted to your ranks Guelphic Protestants who are not of your mind. Since the war ceased—so gloriously for us and so unfortunately for the hopes of the Hanoverians—the Catholics have been made use of to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Guelphs!"

Guelph, it may be recalled, was the patronymic of the royal House of Hanover, the last King of which was that English Duke of Cumberland whom the Irish-Orange body, in conjunction with a large number of high officials in the British army, plotted to place upon the throne of England instead of the present Queen. Bismarck hated these Guelphs with all the intensity of their an-

cient foes, the Ghibellines, because of their English affiliations, and his endeavor to fling the brand of religious discord into the kingdom where so great a post as Minister of Justice had been filled by a Catholic showed to what unscrupulous means he was willing to resort to break down the passive opposition of the newly-absorbed kingdom. But he had confronting him a man who was insensible to fear. Windthorst at once picked up the glove of defiance.

"The 'Centre' party, to which I have the honor to belong," he said, "is not a sectarian faction. The programme of the party has been publicly announced, and all who agree with its provisions are invited to join it, no matter to what sect they belong. If it happens that the greater number of those who agree with us are Catholics, it merely shows that Catholics view political questions from the more humane premises. But it is not true that the principles of my party are mostly adopted by Catholics. There are a great number of Protestants who sympathize with us, and the truth of my words come more into evidence day by day. Further, the 'Centre' is now willing, and will be ever willing, to unite with any party offering a programme acceptable to their convictions. Yes; in the cause of peace it would go even further; when the Catholic grievances are settled, when the unjust attacks on the Church cease, the 'Centre' will willingly disband. But so long as these attacks continue, so long will the 'Centre' hold its ground."

Thus began the war between those two master-minds and their respective forces. Brute force gained the upper hand for the time being, but in the end the astuter strategy of Windthorst gained for the Catholic cause the victory. By allying himself with the leaders of genuine labor reform—the men of thought and moderation, and not the demagogues and Socialists—he secured the most powerful alliance upon which he could possibly rely. But it must not be thought that this was resolved on merely as a piece of political strategy. Windthorst was sincerely devoted to the betterment of the laboring classes and the friendly co-operation of both capital and labor—that system which has done so much to solve the most perplexing problem of the age. Those who remember the success with which the late Mr. Parnell utilized the cause of agrarian reform in Ireland for the furtherance of his policy of Home Rule may trace some connection between his idea and that of Windthorst when the latter accepted this seemingly unequal conflict with the greatest military power of modern days.

We have it now under the authority of Dr. Busch that Bismarck had no real fear of the effects of the decree of Papal Infallibility, as he pretended, when he began the Kulturkampf. In his old days he admitted this, and threw the blame for the enactment of the May Laws upon Dr. Falck. It is scarcely

credible that a man of German birth, no matter how estranged from the rest of his countrymen by his position and his bringing-up, could deliberately contemplate a widespread persecution of a large proportion of them for conscience' sake, as part of the development of a vast, intricate and profound scheme of imperial policy. We can conceive of his using duplicity in the carrying out of his policy so far as it related to a foreign power like France, but the cold-blooded action of this bold schemer regarding Denmark and Austria (wherein German blood was as largely represented in the population as in any other portion of the Teutonic regions of Europe) reveals to us the utterly unmitigable and unscrupulous fibre of his mind. He was well served in his ambitious designs by one who was equally devoid of scruple. Posterity shudders at the treachery of Count Julian, the betrayer of his country to the Moors, and the perfidy of the Irish king who brought the Norman lances into Ireland in support of an unholy cause. These high crimes had at least the excuse of revenge, but what shall we say of the action of a general like Von Möltke, himself a Dane, in planning the campaign against his own country and leading her enemies to the attack in person? Bismarck and Möltke—these were the two Mephistophelean intellects who began the readjustment of the map of Europe as the Treaty of Paris had left it in 1815, and enabled the edifices of "unity" in Italy and Germany to be raised on the bases of perfidy and plunder of the weak.

Twenty years have now passed since the battle of the Kulturkampf ended by the retreat of the aggressor, and the whole incident, under the softening influences of remoteness, loses its roughness and angularities. Persecution for religion's sake, some good souls would have us believe, is only a tradition of the incorrigible past; the enlightened present rejects it with pity. But we are dealing with facts as hard as granite, and not to be so easily polished. Bismarck's persecution of the Catholics of Germany was no Kriegspiel; it was real grim-visaged war—war without provocation, and war waged of malice aforethought and in cold blood. As it would be impossible in the limits of a brief paper to give an idea of what that persecution meant in every diocese and every parish of an extensive empire, over so extended a period as it covered, it will be found serviceable to present an outline of the general proceedings of the Imperial Government for a short given period, as a guide to the sum total.

The dioceses of Posen and Gnesen may be taken as types. Shortly before hostilities were suspended their condition was thus authoritatively stated:

In the diocese of Posen, twenty parishes, counting thirty-one thousand five hundred and twenty-two souls, were deprived of divine service, partly by the death of priests whom Government does not allow to be replaced, partly by the imprisonment of those who refused to name the apostolic delegate.

The parish of Nekla, near Kostryn, one thousand two hundred and fifteen souls, is equally deprived of divine service. The priest of this parish, having corresponded with the commissary intrusted by the Government with the administration of church property, lost the confidence of his parishioners, and was obliged to resign.

In the diocese of Gnesen divine service has ceased in ten parishes (twelve thousand five hundred and thirty-three souls) in consequence of the demise of their vicars.

Five other parishes of seven thousand seven hundred and fifty-one souls were, during, more or less, four months, deprived of divine service in consequence of the imprisonment of their parish priests, for refusing to name the apostolic delegate. They were released as soon as the Government succeeded in finding him out.

In both dioceses the ecclesiastical seminaries were closed—at Posen two years ago, at Gnesen three months ago. The two assistant bishops were exiled, and will be imprisoned should they return. The one was condemned to nine months' imprisonment for having consecrated the oils on Holy Thursday, the other to six months' imprisonment for having given Confirmation once only.

Fifty parishes at least in the two dioceses have but one priest, when, by the size of the parish, two or three are required. Young priests sent to these parishes two years ago have been expelled, imprisoned or banished.

In the parishes deprived of their clergy, no priest, even from an adjoining parish, was allowed to bear spiritual assistance to the dying, unless he obtained leave from the chief President of the province, residing at Posen. The first transgression is punished by a few weeks' imprisonment; the next, by a longer imprisonment, followed by expulsion from their country. Saying Low Mass in another parish, whether it be in a church or in a private chapel, was subject to the same penalty, if it were proved that any one person was present besides the servers.

Some young priests wore disguise, and let their beards and whiskers grow in order not to be recognized, and to be thus able to make themselves useful here and there: none had been discovered. If they were, they would be condemned to prison for a period not exceeding two years, to be followed by banishment.

Parishioners bereft of their clergy assembled in their churches for prayer and chanting in common on Sundays and feast days. If sometimes a priest in disguise entered the church and performed the service, sentinels were placed on watch in order to give notice in case of the approach of the police.

When it became known that a priest had been in the church, and the police asked his name from the peasants, and whence he came, they always answered he must have come from Jerusalem or from Rome.

Domiciliary visits were very frequent. Some priests have had to undergo more than one. Private papers and letters not only were read with curiosity, but were confiscated, especially if they seemed to throw any kind of suspicion on anyone. Such searches could not be made unless authorized by the *procureur*. However, when they did take place illegally, complaints were of no avail.

Those priests who were imprisoned only for having refused to name the delegate were allowed the use of books, paper and pen; they might have light in the evening and procure their own food.

Mass was not allowed, not even in the chapel of the prison.

The heaviest penalties were inflicted on those priests who had refused to correspond with the commissaries appointed by Falck to administer the property of the Church. This refusal involved enormously heavy fines, exceeding in several cases the yearly income of those who were condemned to them. If the offence was repeated, the delinquent was forthwith banished.

The clergy of the Archdiocese of Gnesen and Posen who were imprisoned and banished for infractions of the Falck laws up to August, 1875, comprised one archbishop, two bishops, four canons, one prelate of the household of the Holy Father, twenty-nine deans, thirteen parish priests, and fifty-one vicars, young priests and monks.

Some were imprisoned merely because they had performed their spiritual functions without the authorization of the civil power; others, on feast days at their neighbors', had been found to preach, say Mass, and hear confessions; or, in a destitute parish, to administer the holy sacraments to the dying.

At least four hundred priests of the two archdioceses were fined. The fines imposed were in some instances very large, sometimes as much as a thousand thalers.

But Bismarck soon found that he was merely trying to cleave with his cavalry sword "the intrenchant air" in this inglorious domestic war. It was not a seven weeks' war, like that with Austria; nor was it ended so soon as the more terrible struggle

with France. Two years of unsuccessful aggression convinced him that he was fighting a losing cause; then he reluctantly called off the bandogs. Before Windthorst died, in May, 1875, he had the gratification of knowing that the struggle was almost over, and that victory rested on the Catholic banners.

Whoever has watched the course of events since that period must have noted the logical sequence between that merciless persecution and the gradual decline of the tall bully who conceived and directed it. The consolidation of the Catholic forces was directly due to it, as by a natural law. Bismarck had made the mistake which Von Möltke never committed. He had underestimated the power of the party whom he had made a foe. He had undervalued the tenacity of the Centrists; he had underrated the sympathy which they were likely to attract by reason of the identity of their aim with the aspirations of the better classes of the toilers in field and factory. The Gesellen Verein was already in existence before the Kulturkampf began. It was composed of the respectable young mechanics in all the towns, and its universality and close organization throughout the Empire told eloquently of the genius and perseverance of its originator, the late Rev. Adolf Kopling. This vast organization, which reckons over a thousand branches, is a strictly Catholic body; but there are other associations which, though not strictly religious, are in sympathy with it, and are, therefore, equally reliable as a rampart against both infidel Socialism and that military despotism which is so largely responsible for the growth of infidel Socialism in many parts of Europe. The Bauern-Verein and the Arbeiter-Verein, great peasants' and artisans' associations of strictly economic origin, have been found immensely helpful. But one of the greatest forces which the persecution called into being were the parish religious organizations for the instruction of the young. These had been already in existence to a large extent before that era, but when the hour of trial came and the parishes were bereft of their legitimate guides and friends a new ardor was developed, and the zeal and number of those lay helpers increased in wonderful ratio. The passive resistance of the Catholic people to the wanton outrage of the creator of German unity, in the result, proved far more effective in its real unification than the defeat of the armies of the component States in the field and the moral preponderance of Prussia.

Bismarck's real aim in starting the Kulturkampf was not so much to persecute the Catholics as to bend the Church to the level of the "Evangelical" establishment, as the State Church in

Prussia is called. This ecclesiastical body has accepted the control of the State unreservedly. It is perfectly willing to be regarded as a department of the State. Its ministers are obliged to study in a university provided by the State, and Cardinal Moran is authority for the statement that with one solitary exception these professors are all avowed atheists and infidels. In the dogma of Papal Infallibility he discerned the most formidable obstacles to this unscrupulous ambition of his; hence his declaration that that decree made Rome the national enemy of every European State. The Falck laws, he over and over again repeated, were not set up as a persecution of Catholics, but only a measure of defence against foreign aggression. "We will never go to Canossa," he proudly declared, when beginning the war; but it was an idle boast. He was utterly unprepared for the strenuous resistance which he encountered all along the line. The vitality and spirit of the Catholics was a factor he had altogether left out of calculation when maturing his plans.

Bismarck's failure to crush freedom in Germany proves nothing more conclusively than the power of egotism to blind men to their own mortal weaknesses. Egotism is the vice of the age. It is accountable for the destruction of armies, the ruin of empires. Had Bismarck been capable of learning, he would have profited by the experience of Bonaparte in his bootless attempt to put down the Papacy and chain the Church to his chariot-wheels. But the intoxication of military success was upon him, so that he dreamed, like the Titan, he might be able to scale heaven. But what a different being do we find him twenty years later! It was such a man, surely, Shakespeare contemplated when drawing the picture of the Duke of Gloucester contemplating his own fate:

> "To have no creature love me living, nor my memory when dead."

What could be more profoundly pathetic than Bismarck's wail in his last illness?

> "Nobody loves me for what I have done. I have never made anybody happy—not myself, nor my family, nor anybody else. But how many have I made unhappy! But for me three great wars would not have been fought, eighty thousand men would not have perished. Parents, brothers, sisters and widows would not be bereaved and plunged into mourning. . . . I have had little or no joy from all my achievements; nothing but vexation, care and trouble."

No wonder men involuntarily say, "God reigns."

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

## RECENT ENCYCLICALS OF POPE LEO XIII.

DESPITE his great age, the Holy Father continues to furnish to mankind such proofs of unabated mental activity, together with the physical vitality which is necessary to sustain it, as the world is rarely wont to behold on the part of those who are nearing the nonagenary mark. Recently we had from his pen two Encyclicals of a character destined to be historical. One was addressed to the Scottish Church and people, the other to the Italian bishops and clergy. In the first-named document we find the logical sequel to the first official act of the Holy Father. The "evvivas" of his enthronement as Pontiff were still ringing in his ears when he sat down to pen an Encyclical restoring to Scotland her ancient system of hierarchy, thus completing the work began by his illustrious predecessor, Pope Pius IX., with regard to the Church of Great Britain. The new Encyclical affords proof of the integrity of those splendid mnemotechnical gifts which frequently shine forth in the Holy Father's pronouncements, and as a graphic sketch of the glories of the Scottish Church in the past is not a little calculated to stimulate study and inquiry in this somewhat neglected field, by a happy coincidence this REVIEW is enabled to lay before the reader in this issue the first of a couple of scholarly papers treating of the subject from the pen of the Sub-Prior of the Benedictines at Fort Augustus, Scotland, the Very Rev. Dom. Michael Barrett. The next of the series will deal with the exciting period of the onslaught of the "Reformers" and the murder of Cardinal Beaton, whose virtues and talents have been strikingly set forth in a recent article by that eminent Scottish writer, Mr. Andrew Lang, in a noble vindication of the prelate from the ignorant aspersions of Robertson and other shallow historians. In his affectionate address to the stray sheep of the Scottish fold, the Holy Father pays tribute to their fidelity under all circumstances to the Divine Word, and in this respect, at least, Scotland occupies a place distinct from the leading countries which rejected the authority of the Church. There is very little atheism or agnosticism there; wild and fanciful metaphysical speculation is alien to the Scottish intellect.

We cannot believe that his affectionate and weighty words will be altogether wasted. Much of his appeal will, no doubt, fall

upon barren soil, but some must assuredly find more genial ground, take root, and fructify.

Concerning the Encyclical on Italian affairs, the reasons which have called it forth are of a widely different character. The men who are now awkwardly attempting to lift the chariot of State out of the inextricable plight into which Crispi and his bungling successors guided it have had the audacity to blame the Vatican for the recent disorders in the peninsula. Is it to be expected that the illustrious Head of the Church should remain silent, and so, inferentially, acquiescent under so great a wrong? Personally he has borne much from the instruments of Italian tyranny; when they attempt, under the most flagitiously false pretences, to scourge the Church and to break up its social arrangements all over the country, it is surely time that the supreme shepherd should be heard in defence of his charge. If the Italian Government had not been so thoroughly driven to its wits' end by the desperate straits of its downward course, it could never dream of demolishing those barriers against that anarchy for the existence of which that government itself is so largely responsible. But as drowning men in their agony of fear clutch even at straws, the incapable holders of portfolios have resorted to the extreme measure of making the situation worse in the desperate hope of the ruined gambler when he flings his last coin into the balance of adverse chance. It will be observed that the keynote of the remarkable document in which the Holy Father delivers himself on this suicidal folly is courage. Not a tremor is perceptible in the voice which proclaims the wrongs of the Church and the protest of its illustrious head. Calmness under trial is counselled to the flock, yet the shepherd will not waive one iota of his indefeasible claims, no matter how the storm of persecution rages. In spirit, in energy, in the confidence of Divine sustainment in all vicissitudes of mundane fortune, this Encyclical takes rank with the most memorable declarations of the Apostolic See on questions which have changed the faces of kingdoms and human society. It is a truly historic Encyclical, and therefore its text will be carefully preserved by every historical student and philosopher. It is the custom of this Review to give these important pronouncements of the Holy Father in a carefully revised translation, but it is rarely that one follows so closely upon the appearance of another as in this case. The fact speaks eloquently of the vigilance, the comprehensiveness, and the solicitude with which the Holy Father, bowed down as he is by a great weight of years, continues to watch over the interests of his world-wide flock.

## TO THE BISHOPS OF SCOTLAND.

To Our Venerable Brethren
The Archbishops and Bishops of Scotland.

LEO XIII.

Venerable Brethren,
Health and Apostolic Blessing.

THE ardent charity which renders Us solicitous of Our separated brethren in no wise permits Us to cease Our efforts to bring back to the embrace of the Good Shepherd those whom manifold error causes to stand aloof from the one Fold of Christ. Day after day We deplore more deeply the unhappy lot of those who are deprived of the fulness of the Christian Faith. Wherefore, moved by the sense of the responsibility which Our most sacred office entails, and by the spirit and grace of the most loving Saviour of men, Whom We unworthily represent, We are constantly imploring them to agree at last to restore together with Us the communion of the one and the same faith. A momentous work, and of all human works the most difficult to be accomplished; one which God's almighty power alone can effect. But for this very reason We do not lose heart, nor are We deterred from our purpose by the magnitude of the difficulties which cannot be overcome by human power alone. "We preach Christ crucified . . . and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1 Cor. i. 23-25). In the midst of so many errors and of so many evils with which We are afflicted or threatened, We continue to point out whence salvation should be sought, exhorting and admonishing all nations to lift up "their eyes to the mountains whence help shall come" (Ps. cxx.). For indeed that which Isaias spoke in prophecy has been fulfilled, and the Church of God stands forth so conspicuously by its Divine origin and authority that it can be distinguished by all beholders: "And in the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains and shall be exalted above the hills" (Is. ii. 2).

Scotland, so dear to the Holy See, and in a special manner to Us, has its place in Our care and solicitude. We love to recall the fact that over twenty years ago the first act of Our Apostolic

Ministry was performed in favor of Scotland, for on the second day of our Pontificate We gave back to the Scottish people their Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. From that day forward, with your efficient co-operation, Venerable Brethren, and that of your clergy, We have constantly sought to promote the welfare of your nation, which is naturally inclined to embrace the truth. And now that We are so far advanced in years that the end cannot be delayed much longer, We have thought it meet to address you, Venerable Brethren, and thus give your nation a further proof of Our Apostolic affection.

The terrible storm which swept over the Church in the sixteenth century deprived the vast majority of the Scottish people, as well as many other peoples of Europe, of that Catholic Faith which they had gloriously held for over one thousand years. It is most pleasing to Us to revert to the great achievements of your forefathers on behalf of Catholicism, and also to allude to some of those, and they are many, to whose virtue and illustrious deeds Scotland owes so much of her renown. Surely your fellow-countrymen will not take it ill that We should again remind them of what they owe to the Catholic Church and to the Apostolic See. We speak of what you already know. As your ancient Annals relate, St. Ninian, a countryman of yours, was so inflamed with the desire of greater spiritual progress by the reading of Holy Writ, that he exclaimed: "I shall rise and go over sea and land, seeking that truth which my soul loveth. But is so much trouble needful? Was it not said to Peter: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it'? Therefore, in the faith of Peter there is nothing wanting, nothing obscure, nothing imperfect, nothing against which evil doctrines and pernicious views can prevail, after the manner of the gates of hell. And where is the faith of Peter but in the See of Peter? Thither, thither I must repair, that going forth from my country, from my kindred, and from my father's house, I may see in the land of the Vision the will of the Lord and be protected by His Temple." (*Ex Hist. Vitæ S. Niniani a S. Aelredo Ab. cons.*) Hence, full of reverence he hastened to Rome, and when at the Tomb of the Apostles he had imbibed in abundance Catholic truth at its very source and fountainhead, by command of the Supreme Pontiff he returned home, preached the true Roman faith to his fellow-countrymen, and founded the Church of Galloway about two hundred years before St. Augustine landed in England. This was the faith of St. Columba; this was the faith kept so religiously and preached

so zealously by the monks of old, whose chief centre, Iona, was rendered famous by their eminent virtues. Need We mention Queen Margaret, a light and ornament not only of Scotland, but of the whole of Christendom, who, though she occupied the most exalted position in point of worldly dignity, sought only in her whole life things eternal and divine, and thus spread throughout the Church the fame of her virtues? There can be no doubt she owed this her eminent sanctity to the influence and guidance of the Catholic Faith. And did not the power and constancy of the Catholic faith give to Wallace and Bruce, the two great heroes of your race, their indomitable courage in defence of their country? We say nothing of the immense number of those who achieved so much for the commonwealth, and who belong to that progeny which the Catholic Church has never ceased to bring forth. We say nothing of the advantages which your nation has derived from her influence. It is undeniable that it was through her wisdom and authority that those famous seats of learning were opened at St. Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen, and that your judicial system was drawn up and adopted. Hence We can well understand why Scotland has been honored by the title of "Special Daughter of the Holy See."

But since then a great change has come to pass, the ancient faith having been extinguished in the minds of the vast majority of your countrymen. Are we to suppose that it will never be restored? There are indeed some signs which lead Us to hope that, by the grace of God, a brighter religious future awaits the Scotch people. We see that Catholics are more liberally and kindly dealt with as time goes on, that Catholic doctrines are no longer publicly held up to scorn, as perhaps was formerly the case; but, on the contrary, are favorably considered by many, and accepted by not a few. We also perceive that false views and opinions, which effectively prevent the perception of truth, are gradually disappearing. May the search after truth spread more, for there is no doubt that an accurate knowledge of the Catholic Religion, drawn from its own, and not from extraneous sources, will clear away many prejudices.

Great praise is due to the Scottish nation, as a whole, that they have always shown reverence and love for the inspired Writings. They cannot therefore be unwilling to listen to a few words which in Our affection We would address to them on this subject with a view to their eternal welfare; since We find that in revering the Sacred Scriptures, they are in agreement with the Catholic Church. Why then should this not be the starting-point for a re-

turn to unity? We beg them to remember that they have the Books of the Old Covenant and of the New from the Catholic Church and from the Catholic Church alone. If these Inspired Writings have passed unscathed through the many and dangerous vicissitudes of centuries, such a blessing is to be attributed to her never-failing vigilance and unceasing care. History attests that in the early ages of the Church the integrity of the Scriptures was preserved by the ever-memorable efforts of the Third Synod of Carthage and of Innocent I., the Roman Pontiff. At a later time no less watchfulness was shown, as we know, by Eugenius IV. and by the Council of Trent. We Ourselves, not unmindful of the necessities of the present day, published a short while ago an Encyclical Letter in which We gravely addressed the Bishops of the Catholic world and diligently admonished them as to the means to be adopted in order to safeguard the integrity and the Divine authority of the Sacred Writings. For owing to the restlessness of modern thought, there are many whom the inordinate desire of superciliously inquiring into everything, and contempt for antiquity, pervert to such a degree, that they either refuse all authority to Holy Writ, or at least seriously curtail and minimize it. These men, puffed up by an exaggerated estimate of their own knowledge, and having an overweening trust in their own judgment, fail to perceive how rash and monstrous it is to try to measure the works of God by our own puny intelligence; nor do they sufficiently heed St. Augustine's warning: "Honor God's Scripture, honor God's Word though not understood, reverently wait in order to understand" (in Ps. 146, n. 12). "Those who study the Venerable Scriptures ought to be admonished . . . . that they must pray in order to comprehend." (Doct. Chr. lib. iii., c. 37, n. 56.) "Lest anything unknown be rashly asserted as known . . . . let nothing be rashly asserted, but all things cautiously and modestly examined" (in Gen. Op. Imp.).

But as the Church was to last to the end of time, something more was required besides the bestowal of the Sacred Scriptures. It was obviously necessary that the Divine Founder should take every precaution, lest the treasure of heavenly given truths, possessed by the Church, should ever be destroyed, which would assuredly have happened, had He left those doctrines to each one's private judgment. It stands to reason, therefore, that a living, perpetual "magisterium" was necessary in the Church from the beginning, which, by the command of Christ himself, should, besides teaching other wholesome doctrines, give an authoritative explanation of Holy Writ, and which, being directed and safeguarded

by Christ himself, could by no means commit itself to erroneous teaching. God has provided for these needs most wisely and effectively through His Only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, Who placed the true sense of the Scriptures in safety when He laid upon His Apostles as His primary and most momentous injunction, not to devote themselves to writing, nor to spreading the volumes of the Old Testament indiscriminately and unguardedly among the multitude, but to teach all nations with the living voice, and to lead them by speech to the knowledge and profession of His Heavenly doctrine: "Going into the whole world preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi., 15). But the supreme teaching authority was committed to one on whom, as on its foundation, the Church must rest. For Christ, when He gave the keys to Peter, gave him at the same time the power to govern those who were charged with the "ministry of the word"; "Confirm thy Brethren" (Luke xxii., 32.) And since the faithful must learn from the "magisterium" of the Church whatever pertains to the salvation of their souls, it follows that they must also learn from it the true meaning of Scripture.

It is easy to perceive how unsafe, how inadequate, and how useless is the method propounded by those who think that the only way to interpret Scripture is by the help of Scripture itself. For on that principle the ultimate law of interpretation would rest with the individual judgment. But, as we have already stated, each one will undertake the reading of Scripture with entirely different feelings, views, and prepossessions, and will interpret God's written Word accordingly. The result will be that those divergent interpretations will necessarily produce discussions and disputes, and thus turn what was intended as a source of union and peace into a source of contention and strife.

The truth of what We have just stated is proven by what has actually taken place, since, of all the sects, deprived as they are of the Catholic Faith and disagreeing among themselves on religious matters, each one claims that its own teaching and practices are in accord with Holy Writ. There is no gift of God so sacred that man cannot abuse it to his own detriment; since, according to the stern warning of Blessed Peter, "the unlearned and unstable wrest" the very Scriptures "to their own destruction" (2 Peter iii., 16). Hence Irenæus, who lived shortly after the Apostolic age, and who is a faithful interpreter of Apostolic doctrine, always taught that a knowledge of the truth could only be had from the living voice of the Church: "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the spirit of God is found, there is the

Church and all grace, and the Spirit is truth." (Adv. Haer. lib. iii.) "Where, therefore, the gifts of God are placed, it is necessary to learn the truth from those who have in the Church the Apostolic Succession." (Adv. Haer. lib. iv.) And if Catholics, who may differ on all other matters, are found united in marvellous concord in the faith, there can be no doubt that this is chiefly owing to the authority and power of the "magisterium."

We know that many of the Scottish people, who do not agree with us in faith, sincerely love the name of Christ, and strive to ascertain His doctrine and to imitate His most holy example. But how can they obtain what they are striving for, if they do not allow themselves to be taught heavenly things in the way prescribed by Jesus Christ Himself; if they do not give heed to the Church whose precepts they are commanded to obey by the Author of faith as if they were His own: "He who heareth you heareth me; he who despiseth you despiseth me"; if they do not seek the nourishment of their souls, and the sustenance of all virtue, from him whom the Supreme Pastor of souls made His vicegerent, to whom He confided the care of the universal Church? In the meantime We are resolved not to fail in doing Our share, and especially to be constant in fervent prayer, that God may move their minds to what is good, and vouchsafe to impart to them the most powerful impulses of His grace. May the Divine clemency, thus earnestly implored by Us, grant to the Church that supreme consolation of speedily embracing the whole Scottish people, restored to the faith of their forefathers "in spirit and in truth." What incalculable blessings would not accrue to them, if they were once more united to us? Perfect and absolute truth would everywhere shine forth, together with the inestimable gifts which were forfeited by separation. There is one amongst all others, the loss of which is more deplorable than words can express; We allude to the most holy Sacrifice in which Jesus Christ, both Priest and Victim, daily offers Himself to His Father, through the ministry of His priests on earth. By virtue of this Sacrifice the infinite merits of Christ, gained by His Precious Blood shed once upon the Cross for the salvation of men, are applied to our souls. This belief prevailed among the Scottish people in St. Columba's day and in subsequent ages, when your grand and majestic cathedrals were raised throughout the land, which still testify to the art and piety of your ancestors.

Now, the very essence of Religion implies Sacrifice. For the perfection of Divine Worship is found in the submissive and reverent acknowledgment that God is the Supreme Lord of all

things, by Whose power we and all our belongings exist. This constitutes the very nature of Sacrifice, which, on this account, is emphatically called a "thing Divine." If Sacrifices are abolished, Religion can neither exist nor be conceived. The Evangelical Law is not inferior, but superior, to the Old Law. It brings to perfection what the Old Law had merely begun. But the Sacrifice of the Cross was prefigured by the sacrifices of the Old Covenant long before the Birth of Jesus Christ; and after His Ascension, the same Sacrifice is continued by the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They greatly err, therefore, who reject this doctrine, as if it diminished the reality and efficacy of the Sacrifice which Christ offered on the Cross. He "was offered once to exhaust the sins of many" (Heb. ix., 28). That atonement for the sins of men was absolutely complete; nor is there any other atonement besides that of the Cross in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. As Religion must ever be accompanied by a sacrificial rite, it was the Divine counsel of the Redeemer that the Sacrifice of the Cross should be perpetuated. This perpetuity is in the most Holy Eucharist, which is not an empty similitude or a mere commemoration, but the very Sacrifice itself under a different appearance, and therefore the whole power of impetration and expiation in the Sacrifice flows from the death of Christ: "For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles" (Mal. i., 2).

It remains for Us now to address the Catholics in a more special manner, and We do so in order that they should co-operate with Us in realizing what We have at heart. Christian charity bids each one labor, according to his opportunities, for the salvation of his fellow-men. We therefore call upon them first of all constantly to offer prayers and supplications to God, Who alone can give the necessary light to the minds of men, and dispose their wills as He pleases. And furthermore, as example is most powerful, let them show themselves worthy of the truth which through Divine mercy they possess, and let them recommend the faith which they hold by edifying and stainless lives. "So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works" (Matth. v., 16). Let them at the same time distinguish themselves by the practice of virtue in public life, so that it should be more and more clearly shown that Catholicism cannot be said, without calumny, to run counter to the interests of the State; but that, on the contrary, nothing else contributes so much to the honorable and successful discharge of social duties.

It is likewise of vital importance to defend most strenuously, to establish more firmly, and to surround with every safeguard, the Catholic education of youth. We are not unmindful of the fact that in Scotland thoroughly efficient schools exist, in which the best method of teaching is to be found. But every effort must be put forth, and every sacrifice must be made, so that Catholic schools should be second to none in point of efficiency. We must not allow our youth to be inferior to others in literary attainments, or in learning, which the Christian faith demands as its honorable accompaniments with a view to its defence and adornment. The love of Religion and country requires that whatever institutions Catholics already possess for the purposes of primary, intermediate, or higher education, should, by the due and proportionate co-operation of all, be consolidated and extended. Justice similarly demands that the education and training of the clergy should be most zealously promoted, as they cannot nowadays occupy worthily and usefully their position, unless they have the prestige of wide erudition and solid learning. In this connection, We can find no institution more worthy of being recommended than Blairs College. An excellent and noble work, begun with exceptional zeal and generosity by one devoted Catholic, this institution should not be allowed to decline and disappear by neglect, but should be sustained by a similar charity, and completed as soon as possible. This will be tantamount to making provision that, for nearly the whole of Scotland, priests will be trained and educated according to the needs of the present time.

All these things, Venerable Brethren, which Our affection for the Scottish people has suggested to Us, we commend to your thoughtfulness and charity. Continue to exercise that zeal of which you have given Us such abundant proof, so that everything may be effected which may conduce to the realization of what we have in view. The matter in hand is extremely difficult, and one the accomplishment of which, as We have repeatedly stated, surpasses all human efforts; but it is most holy and desirable, and in perfect harmony with the counsels of Divine Goodness. Wherefore, We are not so much deterred by the difficulties as We are encouraged by the conviction that the Divine help will not fail, if you devote yourselves to the fulfilment of these Our Wishes and behests.

As a pledge of Divine grace, and as a token of Our fatherly affection, We lovingly impart to you, in the Lord, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy and people our Apostolic Blessing.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the 25th day of July, in the year 1898, and the twenty-first of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., Pope.

## TO THE BISHOPS, CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF ITALY.

## LEO XIII.

VENERABLE BRETHREN AND MOST DEAR CHILDREN, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION.

OFTENTIMES during the course of Our Pontificate, moved by the sacred duty attaching to the apostolic ministry, We have had to complain and protest against the acts designed for the detriment of the Church and of religion by those who, after the changes now so well known, are at the head of public affairs in Italy.

It is unpleasant for Us again to have to speak upon so serious a matter which fills Our soul with profound sadness. We allude to the suppression, recently decreed in various districts of the Peninsula, of so many Catholic institutions. This undeserved and unjust rigor has called forth the reprobation of all honest men, and to Our great sorrow We see that it includes and makes even still more cruel the injuries which now for years past We have had to suffer.

Though the facts are well known to you, Venerable Brethren, We nevertheless deem it opportune to go back upon the origin and necessity of those institutions, which are the fruit of Our solicitude and of your devoted care, in order that all may understand the thought that inspired them and the religious end, both moral and charitable, which they had in view.

### A RETROSPECT.

After the downfall of the civil power of the Popes the Catholic Church in Italy was gradually robbed of her elements of life and action as well as of her native secular influence in public and social life. By a progressive series of systematized oppressions the monasteries and convents were closed; by the confiscation of ecclesiastical property the greater part of the patrimony of the Church was taken away; military service was imposed on the clergy; the freedom of the sacred ministry was shackled by unjust exceptions. Persistent efforts were made to deprive all public institutions of their religious and Christian character; dissident

religions were favored; and whilst the widest liberty was given to the masonic sects, intolerance and odious repression were reserved for the one religion which was ever the glory, the stay and the strength of the Italian people.

We have never failed to deplore these grave and reiterated outrages. We deplored them on account of the danger to which they exposed our holy religion, and we deplored them, too—and We say this from Our heart—on behalf of our country, for religion is the source of a nation's prosperity and greatness and the principal foundation of all well-ordered society. Religious feelings raise and ennoble the soul and instil into it notions of justice and honesty, and when they are weakened men fall away and abandon themselves to their savage instincts and to the pursuit of material interests. The logical outcome of this is bitterness, dissension, depravity, strife, and the disturbance of the public peace—evils which will find no certain or effective remedy in the severity of the law, the rigors of the courts, or the employment of armed force.

In letters addressed to the people of Italy We have more than once warned those on whom falls the serious responsibility of power of this natural and necessary connection between religious decadence and the development of the spirit of revolution and disorder. We have also drawn attention to the inevitable progress of socialism and anarchy, and to the endless evils to which they expose the nation.

But We were not listened to. Paltry sectarian prejudice seemed to blind the public mind, and the war against religion was continued with unabating energy. Far from any measure of redress being undertaken, a persistent attempt was made in books and the daily papers, in schools and universities, clubs and theatres, to scatter broadcast the seeds of irreligion and immorality, to shiver the principles which give birth in a people to morality and uprightness, and to spread the maxims which have for their result perversion of the mind and corruption of the heart.

### A Call to Action.

It was then, Venerable Brethren, that, foreseeing a dark future full of peril for our country, We thought the moment had come for Us to raise Our voice and say to Italians: Religion and Society are in danger; it is time to unfold all your activity and to meet the evils which threaten you with a solid opposition of word and work, by associations and committees, in the press and at public congresses, by confraternities for mutual charity and prayer—in a

word, by every peaceful and lawful means which was calculated to maintain a people's religious spirit and relieve the misery which, ever an evil counsellor, had become so deep and general through the shameful economic condition of Italy. Such were Our recommendations, several times repeated, and particularly in the two letters which we addressed to the Italian people on October 15, 1890, and on December 8, 1892.

And here it is gratifying to Us to declare that Our exhortations fell upon fruitful soil. Through your generous efforts, Venerable Brethren, and through those of the clergy and of the faithful confided to your care, such happy results followed that We were able to hope for still happier in the near future. Hundreds of associations and committees arose in various parts of Italy, which, by their zeal, established rural banks, cheap bakeries, night shelters, clubs for recreation, and catechism classes, whilst others had for their object the visitation of the sick, the protection of widows and orphans. There were, besides, many other charitable institutions which were welcomed with gratitude and blessings by the people, and which received the praise they so well deserved even from the lips of men who belonged to the parties opposed to them. In displaying this praiseworthy Christian activity, Catholics, having nothing to conceal, worked, according to their custom, in the full light of day, and at the same time kept themselves well within the limits of the law.

But, alas! then came those ill-fated riots which resulted in so much disorder and bloodshed, and which flung several districts of Italy into mourning. No one suffered more deeply in his heart's depths, no one was more grieved, than We at this sad spectacle.

We did think, however, that in seeking the secret causes of these riots and civil strifes, those who have the direction of public affairs would recognize the baneful, though natural, fruit of the evil seed which had been so widely, for so long and with such impunity, scattered over the peninsula. We thought that, tracing effects to their causes, and profiting by the sharp lesson they had just received, they would again have recourse to those Christian rules of social organization by the aid of which nations, unless they wish to perish, should reform themselves, and that they would therefore restore to a place of honor those principles of justice, uprightness and religion from which the material well-being of a people flows. We thought that, at least, in searching for the authors and ringleaders of these riots, ministers would be sure to seek them amongst those who hold Catholic teaching in abhorrence, and who excite in men's minds all lawless desires by

naturalism and scientific and political materialism, and amongst those who hide their guilty intentions in the shadow of sectarian assemblies, where they whet their arms against public order and the safety of society. And, indeed, even in the camp of our adversaries, men of elevated and impartial minds were not wanting who understood, and had the praiseworthy courage to proclaim in public the real causes of these deplorable disasters.

Great, then, was Our surprise and sorrow when We learned that, under a ridiculous and ill-concealed pretext, in order to lead public opinion astray and more easily to accomplish a long-premeditated plan, people dared to lay at the door of Catholics the stupid charge of disturbing the peace in order to saddle them with the blame and the disastrous results of the rioting enacted in several parts of Italy.

Our sorrow increased the more when these calumnies were followed up by violent and arbitrary action, and when several leading outspoken Catholic journals were suspended or suppressed, diocesan and parochial committees proscribed, the sittings of congresses disallowed, some institutions rendered powerless and others menaced even amongst those whose only end and aim was the development of piety amongst the faithful or public and private charity; and finally, when numerous inoffensive and useful societies were dissolved, to the destruction, in a few stormy days, of the patient and modest charitable work which had been accomplished during long years by noble minds and generous hearts.

### Inconsistency of the Ministry.

In harking back to these excessive and odious measures the public authorities put themselves at the outset in complete contradiction to their previous professions. For some time past they had sedulously represented the population of the peninsula as in hearty agreement with themselves in their work of revolution and hostility against the Papacy. Now, however, they turn round and belie their former professions by having recourse to exceptional legislation in order to stifle innumerable associations spread throughout Italy for no other reason than their devoted loyalty to the Church and the cause of the Holy See.

Such measures strike at the foundations of justice and even at the regulations of existing laws. In virtue of these principles and regulations it is lawful for Catholics, as for all other citizens, to combine their forces for the promotion of the moral and material well-being of their neighbors, and to devote themselves to practices of piety and religion. It was therefore a most arbitrary

proceeding to dissolve so many Catholic charitable societies, which in other countries are allowed to exist peaceful and respected, and that without any proof of their guilt, without any previous examination, and without any documentary evidence which would show their participation in the disorder that had come about.

It was also especially insulting to Us, who had organized and blessed these useful and peaceful associations, and to you also, Venerable Brethren, who had promoted their development with so much care and watched over their steady progress. Our protection and your vigilance ought to have made them respected and placed them above all suspicion.

We can no longer refrain from declaring how pernicious such measures are to the interests of the people, to the social well-being and the real good of Italy. The suppression of these societies only increases the misery, moral and material, of the people whom they sought to humanize by every possible means; it deprives society of a powerful conservative force; for their organization and the spread of their principles was a bulwark against the subversive theories of socialism and anarchy—in a word, it aggravates more and more the religious conflict which all men who are free from sectarian passion regard as fatal to Italy, whose strength, cohesion and harmony it undermines.

We are not ignorant that the Catholic associations are accused of tendencies opposed to the actual political situation in Italy, and are therefore regarded as subversive. Such an imputation is, however, founded on an equivocation which has been invented, and is designedly maintained, by the enemies of the Church and of religion in order to place in a favorable light before the public the hateful ostracism which they wish to inflict on these associations. But We intend that this mistaken idea should be dissipated forever.

### The Attitude of Italian Catholics.

In virtue of the well-known and immutable principles of their religion, Italian Catholics will have nothing to do with any conspiracy or revolt against the public authorities, to whom they render the obedience which is due to them. Their conduct in the past, to which all men of unbiassed mind can bear honorable witness, is a guarantee of their future behavior, and should be sufficient to secure for them the justice and liberty to which all peaceable citizens have a right. We go farther; by the doctrine they profess they are the staunchest supporters of order, and so they are entitled to respectful treatment. If their worth and merits were properly appreciated, they would, moreover, have a right to the regard and gratitude of those at the head of affairs.

But, at the same time, the Catholics of Italy, for the very reason that they are Catholics, cannot renounce the desire to restore to their Supreme Head the necessary independence and full and effective freedom which are indispensable conditions of the liberty and independence of the Catholic Church. On this point their sentiments are not to be changed either by threats or violence. They will put up with the present situation of affairs, but so long as it shall, at the instigation of anti-religious sectaries, aim at the downfall of the Papacy, they will never be able, without violating their most sacred duties, to uphold it by their adhesion and support. To expect the active co-operation of Catholics for the maintenance of the present order of things would be unreasonable and absurd, for they would then no longer be able to obey the teaching and precepts of the Apostolic See. On the contrary, they would have to act in opposition to that teaching, and to depart from the line of conduct observed by the Catholics of all other nations.

### Why they Refrain from Politics.

This is the reason why, in the present state of affairs, Catholic action, keeping outside politics, concentrates itself upon social and religious work, and looks to raise the people by rendering them obedient to the Church and her Head, by shielding them from the perils of socialism and anarchy, by inculcating respect for the principle of authority, and by lightening their load of poverty by the manifold works of Christian charity. How then can Catholics be called enemies of their country and be confounded with the parties which threaten law and order and the safety of the State? Such calumnies fall to the ground before plain common sense. They rest solely upon the idea that the destiny, unity and prosperity of the nation consist in the deeds that have been perpetrated to the detriment of the Holy See, and which are deplored by men above suspicion who have plainly pointed out the error of provoking a conflict with that great Institution divinely established in Italy, which was, and will ever be, her special and incomparable glory: that wondrous Institution which dominates the course of history, and by which Italy has become the successful teacher of nations, and the head and heart of Christian civilization.

Of what then are Catholics guilty when they long for the end of this long quarrel which is the source of the greatest injury to Italy in the social, moral, and political order; when they demand a hearing for the fatherly voice of their Supreme Head, who has so often claimed the reparation which is his due, demonstrating at the same time what incalculable good would result to Italy.

No; Italy's real enemies must be sought elsewhere; they must be sought amongst the men who, urged on by the spirit of irreligion and having no hearts to feel for the evils and dangers which menace their country, reject every real and effective solution of present difficulties, and endeavor by guilty designs to protract and increase their bitterness. It is to such men as these, and to no others, that the rigorous measures aimed at useful Catholic associations should be applied—measures which afflict Us profoundly for a higher reason that regards not only the Catholics of Italy, but those of the whole world. These measures place in fuller light the painful, precarious, and intolerable position to which We have been reduced. If certain events, in which Catholics had no part, have been sufficient to bring about the suppression of thousands of guileless charitable works, in spite of the guarantees they possessed in the fundamental laws of the State, every sensible and fair-minded man will understand what is the value of the assurances given by the public authorities for the liberty and independence of our Apostolic ministry. To what a point is Our liberty reduced when, after having been deprived of the greatest part of the ancient moral and material resources with which Christian ages had enriched the Apostolic See and the Church in Italy, We are now even deprived of those means of religious and social action which Our solicitude and the admirable zeal of the Bishops, clergy, and people had got together for the defence of religion, and for the good of the Italian people? What is this pretended liberty when another occasion, any incident whatsoever, might serve as a pretext for going still farther along the road of arbitrary violence, and for inflicting fresh and deeper wounds on the Church and on religion?

We wish to point out this state of things to our children in Italy and in other nations. To all of them, however, we would say that if Our sorrow is great, not less great is Our courage, nor less firm Our confidence in that Providence which governs the world, which so constantly and lovingly watches over the Church, and which identifies itself with the Papacy according to the beautiful words of St. Ambrose, "*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.*" Both are divine institutions which have outlived every outrage and attack, and which have seen the centuries go by unshaken, drawing from their misfortunes fresh force, energy and constancy.

As for Ourselves, We shall never cease to love this beautiful and noble country in which we first saw the light, happy in spending our remaining strength in preserving for it the precious treasure

of religion, in keeping its sons in the honorable paths of virtue and duty, and in relieving their misfortunes as long as We are able.

In this noble task We are sure that you, Venerable Brethren, will assist Us with the effective co-operation of your zealous care as enlightened as it is constant. Yes, continue in this holy work, stirring up piety amongst the faithful, preserving souls from the errors and seductions with which they are on all sides surrounded, consoling the poor and the unfortunate by every means that charity can suggest. Whatever may be the trend of events and the opinions of men, your labors will not be in vain, for they have an object higher than the things of earth ; and so, no matter how your toil may be rendered powerless, it will serve to free you before God and man of all responsibility for the evils that, owing to the hindrances placed in the way of your pastoral care, may befall Italy.

And you, Catholic Italians, the chief object of our care and affection ; you who have been the butt of the most painful vexations because of your nearness to Us and your unity with this Apostolic See, you have for your support and encouragement the firm assurances which we give you ; as in past times and in the midst of serious and stormy circumstances the Papacy was always the guide, defence, and safety of Catholic peoples, and especially of the people of Italy, so in the future it will never fail in its great mission of defending and demanding your rights and of assisting you in your difficulties, with all the more love the more you are persecuted and oppressed. You have given, and especially during these later times, numerous evidences of self-sacrificing activity in well-doing. Do not lose courage, but keeping rigorously, as in the past, within the limits prescribed by faith, and in full submission to your pastors, follow out the same line of action with genuine Christian enthusiasm.

Should you encounter fresh contradictions and fresh signs of hostility on the road, do not allow yourselves to be cast down ; for the righteousness of your cause will become clearer day by day for the very reason that your adversaries will be compelled, in order to meet you, to have recourse to similar weapons, whilst the trials you will have to suffer will increase your merit in the eyes of all good men, and what is much more important, before God.

And now, as a pledge of heavenly favor and a token of our special affection receive the Apostolic Blessing, which from the depths of Our heart We lovingly impart to you, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy, and to the Italian people.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the 5th day of August, in the year 1898, and the twenty-first of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

# Scientific Chronicle.

## THE MARVELS OF LIQUEFIED AIR.

In the recently-accomplished reduction of hydrogen to a liquid by chemical process we are likely to witness some startling thaumaturgy, to use the language of the mediæval alchemists. To Professor Dewar, the distinguished English experimentalist, is due the credit of having found the means of accomplishing this feat, a thing often dreamed of by others. The results so far ascertained seem to place the utility of the product far beyond what any experimentalist deemed possible. Others had succeeded in liquefying this factor of the atmosphere in very minute quantity, but Professor Dewar's discovery renders it possible to produce the liquefaction in unlimited volume. He also succeeded in liquefying helium. The importance of the successful carrying out of what has proved a stumbling-block to scientific investigators in the past cannot be overrated. It is already rumored that the density of liquid hydrogen far exceeds that previously arrived at by calculation. The liquefaction of helium was rendered possible by the use of liquid hydrogen, and thus one result of the liquefaction of hydrogen has been the accomplishment of what has hitherto baffled all efforts.

"The Pharmaceutical Era" says, of the discovery, that the idea of a liquid boiling several hundred degrees below zero rather upsets our ordinary conception that boiling means heat that burns. We are not accustomed to air which can be ladled out by the dipperful as a quiet, mobile fluid—one which, while actively boiling, will freeze a beefsteak or absolute alcohol. We have been accustomed to consider heat and cold and boiling and freezing as absolute rather than relative terms, and our prejudices and cherished delusions have been rudely shocked by these scientists. The liquefaction or solidification, by the combination of cold and pressure, of elements hitherto believed to be not susceptible to such changes, has done much to assist the chemist in the verification of his theories, but has, at the same time, shown him that many properties heretofore considered inherent attributes of these elements are characteristics of condition only. The chemical activities and affinities and the physical properties of elements and compounds are changed to a marvellous degree in passing from the gaseous to the liquid state. It has been believed that if hydrogen could only be liquefied, many problems would be rendered easy of solution, many an obscure question be cleared up. Liquid hydrogen is now a fact. Professor Dewar has produced half a wineglassful of liquid hydrogen in five minutes, and reports that the process is applicable to any quantity. Mr. Tripler, the liquid-air manufacturer, will show us how to make it by the gallon or milk-canful. But the interesting feature of Dewar's achievement is that liquid hydrogen boils at 240° below centigrade, or, in other words, it must be liquefied

at or below that temperature. The theoretical absolute zero of the scientist has been put at —273° C. Either Dewar is pretty close to it, or absolute zero must be put down a few more degrees.

The question of the utilization of liquefied air as a motive-power has been discussed, and considerable doubt has been expressed as to its feasibility or its usefulness from both the dynamic and the economic point of view. The subject was exhaustively treated in "The American Machinist" by Mr. Frank Richards, who summed up the matter in these postulations:

"The phenomenon of the boiling of the air is so closely similar to the boiling of water that it is quite possible to conceive of the liquid air being pumped into a carefully-insulated boiler with an ample and always operative safety-valve, just as the feed-water is pumped into a steam-boiler. Here it could re-evaporate just as the water is converted into steam, and then be led to a suitable engine. No fire, of course, would be necessary for the re evaporation. The simple removal of part of the insulation would insure a sufficient communication of heat. There would always be danger of too rapid communication of heat, and consequent uncontrollable increase of pressure."

If we suppose air to be compressed by an exertion of 73 horse-power, then liquefied by Mr. Tripler's process, and then allowed to boil away as suggested above, using the product to drive an engine, we should get from its expansion a little less than one-half of one horse-power, or about two-thirds of 1 per cent. of the initial power employed. Under these circumstances we are not likely to see liquid air extensively and practically employed for power transmission.

But to another class of scientists the possibilities of liquefied air are sought for in quite different fields. We have a story of its powers so wonderful that it recalls the search for the Elixir of Life and the fabled mysteries of the Rosicrucians. A Russian physician (whose name has not yet transpired) has already begun to experiment with it. He placed a dog in a room with the temperature lowered, as stated in "London Engineering," to 100° below zero. After ten hours the dog was taken out alive and with an enormous appetite. The physician tried the test himself. After ten hours' confinement in an atmosphere of still, dry cold, his system was intensely stimulated. So much combustion had been required to keep warm that an intense appetite was created. The process was continued on the man and the dog, and both grew speedily fat and vigorous. It was like a visit to a bracing northern climate. The old saw about "living upon air" will no longer, then, be used in derision; but, along with the blessing of restored digestive powers to the dyspeptic, there arise frightful visions of enormously-increased larder bills to the struggling housekeeper, should liquefied air fulfil the anticipations of the Russian scientist. So while to the few it may be a boon, to the many it may turn out to be something in the nature of a Grecian gift. But it is too soon to anticipate.

## MACHINERY AND TOOLS OF THE ANCIENTS.

A favorite subject of speculation is the sort of appliances used by the workmen who put up the temples which such cities as Persepolis, Karnak and Thebes still show, and the still mightier marvels of the Pyramids. It has been shown that the old builders, in Egypt at least, were familiar with steam power, for a contrivance evidently adapted to this agency was found a good many years ago in contiguity to one of the Pyramids. In "Gibbon" will be found a curious anecdote proving the ingenuity of the early Byzantine Greeks in the heating of houses by steam, and we have a good deal of other evidence to show that the famous discovery of Dr. Watts was only the recovery of a lost art. Many mechanical appliances of the present day are found to have been in use among the ancient Egyptians, and the manual implements of the craftsman in the very early ages of their famous architecture bore a striking resemblance to those in use generally to-day.

A two years' study of Gizeh has convinced Flinders Petrie that the Egyptian stoneworkers of four thousand years ago had a surprising acquaintance with what had been considered modern tools. Amongst the many tools used by the Pyramid builders were both solid and tubular drills and straight and circular saws. The drills, like those of to-day, were set with jewels (probably corundum, as the diamond was very scarce), and even the lathe tools had such cutting edges. So remarkable was the quality of the tubular drills and the skill of the workmen that the cutting marks in hard granite gave no indication of wear of the tool, while a cut of a tenth of an inch was made in the hardest rock at each revolution, and a hole through both the hardest and softest material was bored perfectly smooth and uniform throughout. How the tools themselves were made, and of what metal their heads were composed, is, however, an insoluble mystery.

---

## HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT OF YELLOW FEVER.

The American medical fraternity are investigating the possibility of applying the method of the mother of Achilles to the problem of producing what are styled "immunes." Yellow fever, it is surmised, may possibly be rendered harmless if the subject of it has had one attack before, and got over it without serious results. Dr. Giuseppe Sanarelli, of Brazil, is making successful experiments, it is asserted, in this direction. He has been given an opportunity to put his theories to the test by the Brazilian Government. The State of San Paulo, the richest in Brazil, and highly attractive to emigrants, is made the theatre of experiment. They contract the seeds of disease at the port of their arrival, and then go inland to set up new centres of infection; and

thus the disease formerly confined to coast towns is diffused everywhere, like a spreading conflagration.

Dr. Sanarelli holds entirely original views as to the nature and seat of the disease, and he has studied it so long that people were inclined to give him his way in the making of experiments. But the earlier results were startling. The destruction of life among the newly arrived Europeans, unacclimated and not knowing how to live in tropical countries, had risen to ninety per cent.

In the city of San Carlos do Pinhal is an isolation hospital, and here, at an invitation of the authorities, Dr. Sanarelli, in February last, inaugurated a series of experiments that demonstrated the value of his anti-amarillic serum. He clearly showed that the earlier the serum is used after symptoms appear, the better. It has a direct and immediate action on the kidneys, and he proved that the best action follows injecting it directly into a vein ; he calls this the *intensive* method. The mortality here was only twenty-seven per cent.—a great falling off from ninety.

The serum is produced by subjecting a horse to gradually increasing doses of the yellow-fever virus till he can withstand an amount which, if administered at first, would surely have proved fatal, and the animal has to be under treatment for a year or fourteen months before his blood reaches the proper stage.

---

## ARTIFICIAL PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL.

We believe nearly as many chemists have been wrecked over the theory of the productibility of alcohol from substances other than those used in the distillery as empirics in the hunt for the philosopher's stone. At last, it seems, the momentous question has been decided, and the humble mushroom of commerce is the agency by which the bacchanalian soul can indulge its tastes at a moderate cost, so far as production is concerned. The discovery is claimed for the Pasteur Institute of Lille, the inventor being the president, Dr. Clamette. From Chinese yeast Dr. Clamette succeeded in cultivating a sort of fungoid growth which entirely replaces the yeast hitherto employed. Trials on a large scale have proved the enormous advantage afforded by the use of these cultivated fungi in the place of yeast. In the case of maize brought to fermentation by means of the fungi a much larger quantity and a better quality of alcohol are obtained at a considerably lower expense, the spirit being cleaner and containing less empyreuma —a term expressive of the peculiar smell of burning which characterizes the vapor produced by destructive distillation—as a consequence of the absence of microbes found in yeast. A thousand kilogrammes of corn (a kilogramme being about 2¼ pounds) required but a few grains

of the fungi for purposes of fermentation. Dr. Clamette has further proved that this aseptic method of fermentation works with equal success in the factory and the laboratory, whether employed on a large or a small scale, not one malignant microbe having been found in thousands of gallons.

---

## MOSQUITOES AND MALARIA.

Dr. Koch has adopted the theory that we are indebted to our disagreeable little acquaintance, the mosquito, for the germs of malaria, but it is claimed by other medical authorities that this is by no means a new or original supposition. The *Medical Record* gives the theory a pretty respectable antiquity.

"Linnæus," it states, "was among the first to make the suggestion, although his views in this respect gained no foothold. Dr. Drake and Sir Henry Holland also drew attention to its probability. Latterly many investigators have endeavored to show that the mosquito is indirectly instrumental in the production of many diseases, and especially in that of malaria. Dr. Charles Finlay, of Havana, in 1881, submitted some papers to L'Académie Royale des Sciences Médicales in Belgium, tending to prove that the mosquito under certain conditions may act as the transmitter of yellow fever, and has repeatedly since that time written in support of this belief. Quite recently Dr. Patrick Manson, who for many years has held the belief that the mosquito may 'act as the intermediary host of filaria sanguinis hominis,' has stated his opinion that the mosquito plays the part of the extracorporeal host of the *plasmodium malariæ*. Koch, who has just returned from East Africa, where he has been studying the clinical and etiological aspects of malaria under peculiarly favorable circumstances, is in agreement with these views. He bases this agreement on the ground that mosquitoes are always prevalent wherever malaria prevails, and he mentions one locality in which, mosquitoes being absent, there is no malaria, although the conditions are otherwise favorable to its production. Bignami last year published a paper in which almost identical conclusions were drawn. Referring to the observations of Smith and Kilborne, he drew attention to an example of a disease of the blood due to an intracorpuscular parasite and inoculated into cattle by a suctorial insect, and went on to say: 'Malaria behaves itself with regard to man as if the malarial germs were inoculated by mosquitoes.' As long ago as 1893 Marchiafava repeatedly asserted in private his belief in this mode of transmission of malaria, but he did not publish this view, as what he regarded as a positive demonstration was wanting." It may be remarked that many sound medical men have held that much of our summer sickness is due to the prevalence of a pest not quite so commonly

objurgated as the mosquito—the ordinary house-fly. It takes no scientific observer to remark that this omnipresent pest battens upon every form of accessible filth, and the ordinary "man in the street," who is no scientist at all, may easily conclude that nothing but poison is procurable from such sources, and that that poison must somehow get into the human system, since there is no escaping the contact of the agency by which it is carried about.

---

## THE X-RAY AS A SCIENTIFIC DETECTIVE.

Every fresh case of a conflict between fraud and the law strengthens the conviction that the law ought to depend upon Science more than it does just now in support of the objects of justice. The X-rays, it is apparent to everybody, are instruments for truths as valuable as the phonograph, and when one considers the immense importance of securing truth in all *post-mortem* or *post-factum* questions, it is a matter for regret that the value of this aid to the determination of disputed questions has not been recognized by the law. The value of the X-rays in surgery has been abundantly demonstrated; but while we feel no surprise at the ability of the powerful searchlight to detect the presence of dense substances in semi-transparent fibre, we were not prepared to hear that it would enable us to distinguish between wholesome and unwholesome constituents in food products. But that the X-rays must prove of immense service to human health in this way is now placed beyond the pale of doubt. Practical experiment has been made regarding the detection of the adulteration of flour, as we learn from the *American X-Ray Journal.* How the proof was arrived at is thus told:

"Drs. La Besse and Bleunard placed on an ordinary photographic plate of gelatin-bromid a small pasteboard box, of rectangular shape, from which the top and bottom were removed, retaining, consequently, only the lateral walls, of about one centimeter in height. They divided the box into two equal parts, by means of a small rectangle of convenient dimensions, cut from a visiting-card. This done, they then filled one of the compartments with pure flour, the other with adulterated flour, removed with precaution the separating partition, and lightly tapped the box with a finger, so as to fill up the small empty space, which fills with flour without sensible mixture. The whole was covered with a sheet of tinfoil, with a very narrow rectangular slit cut in it, and placed perpendicularly to the section of separation between the two flours. Exposed to the action of the X-rays, the adulteration was disclosed.

"The presence of 3 per cent. of foreign mineral matter in flour, com-

posed of equal weights of very fine sand and chalk, was ascertained. The adulteration can be detected much easier when the proportion of mineral matter is greater."

The experimentalists say: "It is possible, once the fraud is known, to tell with considerable exactness the quantity of mineral matter introduced. It suffices to compare the tint obtained with an increasing scale of tints, obtained by introducing into pure flour known quantities of foreign mineral matter. Tints vary with the nature of the mineral matter employed in the adulteration, and this method of quantitative analysis can only be approximate."

---

## CABLE-CUTTING IN WAR-TIMES.

We may leave to international jurists the ethical question involved in the severance of ocean cables, as a war measure, by the power able to effect it, but the technical aspect of the subject is of more general interest. This is well set forth by a writer on electricity:

"The grappling for and cutting of a submarine cable are by no means a simple matter unless the ship undertaking this work is provided with all the necessary apparatus. A ship of war usually relies upon what is known as the cutting grapnel to destroy a cable unless it is desired to utilize one section of a cut cable for communicating purposes. In such an event the cable, after being caught in an ordinary grapnel, is brought on board the ship, where it is severed, the end in control of the enemy being securely fastened to a buoy and dropped overboard. Through the other end messages may be transmitted wherever desired, providing the vessel is equipped with suitable transmitting and receiving apparatus. When it is merely desired to part a cable in deep water, a cutting grapnel is lowered and the vessel steams slowly backward and forward at right angles to the line of cable. As soon as the latter is hooked it slips, by means of pulleys, between two heavy knives or teeth, and the strain in lifting causes the teeth to close and bite off the cable."

# Book Notices.

THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST, translated by various Oriental Scholars, and edited by the Rt. Hon. F. Max Muller. American Edition. Vol. I.—The Upanishads; translated by Rt. Hon. F. Max Muller. Part I., pp. ci. 320. Part II., pp. lii. 350. Vol. II.—The Sacred Laws of the Aryas. Translated by George Buhler. Part I. Apastauba and Gautama. Second edition, revised, pp. lxii. 314. Vasistha and Bandhayana, pp. xlv. 360. The Christian Literature Company, New York, 1898. Price, $2.50 per vol.

In this our day and generation, when the human mind, the *curiosum ingenium* of which Seneca speaks, athirst to know the *what* and the *whence* of things—the *why* and the *whither* are too often neglected—leaves nothing unsearched or unquestioned, from the tiniest microbe to the boundless universe, it were to be expected, to be hoped for, that religion, the relation of man to his Maker, should form one of the first and most absorbing subjects of inquiry. Though one may deprecate the errors and misleading theories into which so much of what is termed the study of comparative religion has fallen, it must be allowed that much good has come of it on the whole, and the cause of truth, historical, philosophical and religious, has been thereby advanced. Foremost on the side of gain has been the bringing to light the original documents on which the ancient ethnical religions are historically and speculatively based; and, next to this, the placing those documents, by translation, within the reach of students not themselves specialists in the original languages. For, as Professor Max Müller has aptly said, "how people might or could or should have elaborated religious ideas is a topic most warmly discussed among psychologists and theologians, but a study of the documents, in which alone the actual growth of religious thought can be traced, is much neglected." To have removed reasonable grounds for such neglect by a modernized yet faithful rendering of those documents stands to the credit of scholars like the one just mentioned and his colleagues.

Leaving out of consideration the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, it appears that the only great and original religions which profess to be founded on Sacred Books and the manuscripts whereof are extant are:

1. The religion of the Brahmans.
2. The religion of the followers of Buddha.
3. The religion of the followers of Zarathustra.
4. The religion of the followers of Khung-fû-Zze.
5. The religion of the followers of Lao-Zze.
6. The religion of the followers of Mohammed.

Until Professor Max Müller and his colaborers, some twenty years ago,

began the series of English translations since so well known under the general caption, "The Sacred Books of the East," the documents on which these great ethnical religions are based were, on the whole, accessible only to the learned few. Up to the present, moreover, this splendid set of volumes—which have increased, by the way, from the number, twenty-four, originally contemplated, to about forty—having necessarily, from their special character, a limited sale, were beyond the reach of the impecunious. The publishers of the two volumes quoted above have undertaken to bring out an American reprint of the English edition at a price that brings the work within the means of students unfavored by fortune, whilst the typographical and general material excellence of the original are retained. The order of the volumes in the English edition has been improved on in the reprint. In the former the first part of the Upanishads appeared in the first volume, the second part in the fifteenth. In the first of the two volumes above these two parts have been brought together. In the second volume above, Professor Bühler's translation of the Sacred Laws of the Aryas are united. In the original they are divided between the second and the fourteenth volumes.

Readers who have derived their knowledge of the cults of the Far East, especially of Brahmanism and Buddhism, from summaries or lectures in which the gems and pearls of Oriental thought are strung together as though they represented the essence of Indian religion, will have their notions shocked when they come to study the authoritative source by finding themselves obliged to wade through pages of matter which, as Max Müller admits, "is not only unmeaning, artificial and silly, but even hideous and repellent" (p. xii.), before coming across a thought that is beautiful or inspiring. "No doubt," as the same learned authority remarks, "there is much in these old books that is startling by its very simplicity and truth, much that is elevated and elevating, much that is beautiful and sublime; but people who have vague ideas of primeval wisdom and the splendor of Eastern poetry will soon find themselves grievously disappointed. It cannot be too strongly stated that the chief, and in many cases the only interest of the Sacred Books of the East, is historical; that much in them is extremely childish, tedious, if not repulsive." Indeed, though we have the assurance that the present translations are "truthful and unvarnished," yet there are some passages of the original that "could not be rendered into modern language without the appearance of coarseness" (p. xxi.). The translator has felt obliged to leave some of these unrendered, the original being given, when necessary, in a note.

The spirit in which the earnest student should take up the study of comparative religion has been so aptly expressed by Cardinal Newman that we can find no better illustration than his words of the value of the Sacred Books of the East. "We know well enough, for practical purposes, what is meant by Revealed Religion—viz., that it is the doctrine taught

in the Mosaic and Christian Dispensations and contained in the Holy Scriptures, and is from God, in a sense in which no other doctrine can be said to be from Him. Yet if we would speak correctly we must confess, on the authority of the Bible itself, that all knowledge of religion is from Him, and not only that which the Bible has transmitted to us. There never was a time when God had not spoken to man, and told him to a certain extent his duty. We are expressly told in the New Testament that at no time He left Himself without witness in the world, and that in every nation He accepts those who fear and obey Him. It would seem, then, that there is something true and divinely revealed in every religion, all over the earth, overloaded as it may be, and at times even stifled, by the impieties which the corrupt will and understanding of man have incorporated with it; so that Revelation, properly speaking, is a universal, not a local gift. The Word and the Sacraments are the characteristics of the elect people of God; but all men have had more or less the guidance of Tradition, in addition to those internal notions of right and wrong which the Spirit has put into the heart of each individual. This vague and uncertain family of religious truths, originally from God, but sojourning without the sanction of miracle, or a definite home, as pilgrims up and down the world, and discernible and separable from the corrupt legends with which they are mixed by the spiritual mind alone, may be called the *Dispensation of Paganism*, after the example of St. Clement of Alexandria. And further, Scripture gives us reason to believe that traditions thus originally delivered to mankind at large have been secretly reanimated and reinforced by the communications from the unseen world; though these were not of such a nature as to be produced as evidence, or used as criteria and tests, and roused the attention rather than informed the understanding of the heathen. The book of Genesis contains a record of the Dispensation of Natural Religion or Paganism, as well as of the patriarchal. Job was a pagan in the same sense in which the Eastern natives are pagans in the present day. He lived among idolators, yet he and his friends had cleaned themselves from the superstitions with which the true creed was beset; and while one of them was divinely instructed by dreams, he himself at length heard the voice of God out of the whirlwind, in recompense for his long trial and faithfulness under it. There is nothing unreasonable in the notion that there may have been poets and sages or sibyls again, in a certain extent divinely illuminated, and organs through whom religious and moral truth was conveyed to their countrymen; though their knowledge of the Power from whom the gift came, nay, and their perception of the gift as existing in themselves, may have been very faint and defective" (The Arians of the Fourth Cent., p. 81).

Those who take the enlightened view thus vividly reflected by Cardinal Newman from the mind of the early Christian Fathers, have a key to the meaning of the Ethnic religions and to the genius of their mixed charac-

ter—a key unsupplied by the modern evolutionary hypothesis put forth by Professor Max Müller in his very able and interesting Preface to the present series of the Sacred Books. This is not the place to enter on a polemic against that hypothesis in the connection in point, but it may be the place to protest against the following comparison which the learned Professor forces into his text: "There are certainly many passages in the Vedic writings which prohibit the promiscuous communication of the Veda, but those who maintain that the Brahmans, *like Roman Catholic priests, keep their sacred books from the people*, must have forgotten," etc. (p. xxii.). (Italics ours.) Isn't it marvellous that even in a work of this kind room could be found for such a calumnious slur at Catholicism? Is it possible that Professor Max Müller, who is in other respects justly recognized as one of the most learned of contemporary scholars, believes that the Roman Catholic priests keep their sacred books from the people? Does he not know that the principal of those books exist in modern translations, procurable, together with the originals, at the book-shops, and that the rest of them are open to any one that can read their simple Latin?

Lastly, there is one aspect in the study of comparative religion that ought not to be passed over in the present notice. In alluding to it we may borrow the words of one who has written eloquently on this subject, and to whom, also, we owe the above extract from Cardinal Newman. We refer to Mr. W. S. Lilly. Protesting against a certain suspicion that has fallen in these studies, he says: "No intellectual pursuit is without its dangers. Knowledge in any department into which the mind of man can penetrate is but learned ignorance unless she is conscious of her own imperfection—her need of help from that 'wisdom which is from above,"

> A higher hand must make her mild,
> If all be not in vain, and guide
> Her footsteps, moving side by side,
> With Wisdom, like the younger child.

True is this of the knowledge made accessible to us by the volumes of which I have been speaking, as of all knowledge. For the rest, it seems to me that the religious mind, while reverently and gladly recognizing in these non-Christian systems such verities, theological and ethical, as they present—remembering, with St. Augustine, 'Nec quisquam præter Te alius est Doctor veri ubicimque et undecumque claruerit'—will be inspired with thoughts of devout thankfulness to the Giver of all good, who, according to the expression of the Prince of the Apostles, has called us into 'His admirable light.' An admirable light, indeed! How admirable we shall best understand by comparing it with the surrounding darkness, fitfully relieved by here and there a bright beam of truth, in which so incalculably vast a proportion of the children of men have been shrouded. Why we have thus been distinguished, thus made to differ from others, is of course a mystery—one of the countless mys-

teries which surround us in the order of Grace, as in the order of Nature. Here, as at every step we take in any of the paths of life, all our speculations may well lead us to the conclusion, O altitudo divitianum sapientiæ Dei ! quam incomprehensibilia sunt judicia ejus, et investigabiles viæ ejus." (*Dublin Review*, July, 1883.)

This mental attitude which sees in the Non-Christian Religions the fainter glimmerings of that Divine Light which has shone in a larger fullness in the Christian Dispensation is as far removed from that evolutionary standpoint which looks at all Religions as merely different phases in the development of the religious consciousness, as it plainly is from a pharisaical temper that finds in its own more favored possession of truth an occasion for despising those of the great human family whom the All Father has less richly blessed. Christianity proves itself historically to be a new and distinct revelation—a revelation, too, that is final, never to be superseded by any other—superadding to the ancient religious beliefs and laws a higher order of truths and duties, amongst which the obligation of accepting that revelation as delivered and entrusted to definitely selected messengers for propagation to all men until the end of time. This, however, is a thesis whose development here would carry us too far afield, and, besides, is not essential to our present scope of vindicating the attitude of the Christian mind to the Religions whose documentary bases is given in the present works. A word, however, should be said, in conclusion, as to the special contents of the two volumes at hand. The former contains the more important *Upanishads*. The precise meaning of this term is uncertain, as the reader of Max Müller's learned discussion will find, but it is used here to designate a treatise in connection with the Sacred Books of the Veda. If we call the Vedic books the ancient Aryan Bible, the Upanishads are theological and philosophical treatises speculatively involved therefrom. Their theology is Monotheistic, their philosophy—called the *Vedantic*, because expressing the end of the Vedas—is Monistic or Pantheistic. Of the hundred and eight Upanishads now in possession of Sancrit scholars, Professor Max Müller presents in this volume the translation of the twelve most important. They have special value for the student of philosophy who seeks for the early development of Eastern pantheism. The second volume above gives a translation of the Sacred Laws of the Aryas, that is, the traditionary rules of conduct as interpreted in the more celebrated schools of ancient India—Apastamba, Gautama, etc. The rules, here laid down and explained often at to us tedious length, cover almost every detail of life, private, domestic, public—entering into minutiæ that remind us of the Chinese Book of Rites, or the to us trivialities of the ceremonial features of the Talmud. One wanders over page after page without coming across a thought worthy of carrying away. Nevertheless, the collections of these laws of life have their historic value in showing the simple manners of the people they regulated. Higher, however, still is their worth in evoking in the Christian

heart a feeling of gratitude to the Providence that has given us gratuitously the inestimable liberty of the fuller Truth that has made us free.

F. P. S.

LES ORIGINES DE LA PSYCHOLOGIE CONTEMPORAINE, par D. Mercier, Prof. Ord. de la Fac. de Phil. et Lettres, Directeur de l'Institut sup. de philos. a l'Université de Louvain. Louvain, Institut, 1 Rue des Flamands. 1897, pp. xii.-486. Pr. 5 francs.

Amongst those who have labored most earnestly in recent years at the revival of Scholasticism and its adaptation to the present condition of physical science, the author of the work at hand deserves prominent mention. The founder of the Higher Institute of Philosophy at the Louvain University, his work there in empirical psychology has commanded attention far beyond the limits of his own country. The *Revue Neo-scholastique*, a quarterly which he established in 1894 in connection with the Institute, has been of great value in disseminating the results, speculative and experimental, of his own labors and those of his associates at Louvain. Besides this, he has under publication an extended course of philosophy, the Psychology of which has been particularly well received in European circles to which Catholic philosophy had hitherto gained but little access. The comment of the *Revue Scientifique* in this connection is worth quoting as illustrating both the estimation which Neo-scholasticism in general and M. Mercier's endeavors in particular are gaining in quarters not likely to be biased in their favor. "The Neo-Thomistic school has rejuvenated scholastic teaching by imbibing thoroughly the true peripatetic spirit; it abandons all teachings that had been founded on an insufficient knowledge of nature and takes advantage of modern discoveries, studying them according to the Aristotelian method. The vitality of this philosophy is so great that it is able to assimilate the results of contemporary research in psychology and psycho-physics without making any concession, without emasculating science, as is done daily in the ordinary analogous books. Far from fearing the investigations of physiologists, it regrets that their studies on the nervous system, the localization of functions and the senses, are not more developed; for in all these it recognizes indispensable auxiliaries. M. Mercier congratulates the promoters of physiological psychology for having renewed traditions which an interval of several centuries had broken" (Tom. LI. 1893). The fact that M. Mercier's work at filling up and rounding off the more abstract system of sound philosophy with the concrete results of experimental sciences proceeds *sans faire aucune concession*, is likewise emphasized by the reception given to his Psychology by the Catholic press of France and Germany. Passing over the minor opuscula, which the author has published in the same spirit on particular philosophical topics, we come to his latest work in this order, his present history of modern psychology. The purpose and spirit of this work cannot be better indicated than by its opening paragraph. "The point of view we have taken," says Dr. Mercier, "is that of the philosophy of Aristotle and of the masters of

Scholasticism. But whilst and because we are penetrated with the genuine peripatetic spirit, we would hold ourselves in constant relation with the science and the thought of our contemporaries. The Middle Ages excelled in the contemplation of general truths; but seekers in the modern age are marvellously equipped for the work of analysis, in which they show no less patience than sagacity. Is it not the task, plainly indicated, of a philosophy already ancient that would live again in the actual world, to confront the wisdom of the ages passed with the new scientific conquests and with the teaching accepted to-day? From the faithful accomplishment of this task is it not lawful to augur progress?''

From this view point the author takes up the study of the contemporary psychology. The beginnings he finds in the psychology of Descartes. The Father of modern philosophy brought about a revolution in fundamental thought by his excessive dualism—his sundering of human nature into two principles, body and soul, not united in the union of entity, substance and personality, as the old philosophy taught, but accidentally conjoined, the body being organized independently of the soul, and the latter located in the pineal gland of the brain as the extrinsic mover of the corporal mechanism. The author follows the result of this dualism. On the one hand the excessive Spiritualism worked itself out in a short time into the Occasionalism and Ontologism of Malebranche, the Pantheism of Spinoza and the excessive Idealism and consequent Scepticism of Locke, Berkeley, Hume and Kant. The other side of the Cartesian Dualism mingling with the Idealism just mentioned, and developing another phase of thought, the Sensism of Locke and Hume in England and of Conillac in France, resulted, through the mediation of Kantism, in Positivism and Agnosticism.

The fundamental problem of psychology is to give an adequate explanation of the relation between body and soul, between the physical and the psychical in human consciousness. M. Mercier examines the theories of the avowed masters of contemporary psychology as to this problem—Herbert Spencer in England, Alfred Fouillée in France, Wilhelm Wundt in Germany—and shows wherein they fall short of a satisfying solution. In each of these representative thinkers he traces the influences of the Cartesian philosophy. The same influences are discernible generally in the modern intellectual world. Descartes restricted psychology to the study of *thought*. At present the *facts* of consciousness are held to constitute the sole sphere of psychology. Metaphysics, and consequently what was formerly known as *rational psychology*, is almost universally abandoned. In its stead is given *idealistic criticism*, whose one object is to determine the limits of thought. Under this influence psychology tends evidently to Idealistic or Subjective Monism. On the other hand, the excessive Mechanicism of Descartes manifests itself in that phase of experimental psychology which considers psychic phenomena on its purely quantitative side.

Having thus far set forth the characteristics and evolution of Cartesian psychology, the author exposes, in opposition to its one-sided *rationalistic* aspect, the scholastic totality of *anthropology*. To the excessive empiricism resulting from Cartesianism he opposes the tempered empiricism of the traditional philosophy. The first four chapters in which the matter is thus unfolded are mainly expository. With the fifth the more critical side of the work begins. First the Idealism that sprang from the Cartesian psychology is criticised. Then the other extreme, the excessive "mechanicism," and thirdly the blended result of the two extremes, agnostic-positivism, are similarly handled. The eighth and closing chapter studies the Neo-Thomistic movement within the Catholic schools, narrating its history, and demonstrating how the old philosophy, with its reasonable conception of human nature as one entity coalescing from the substantial union of the material and spiritual co-principles, adapts itself perfectly both to the rational and the experimental sides of psychology, and can therefore only profit by the results of modern scientific research.

As an appendix to the work is given a table showing the present state of psycho-physiological studies in America—the Institutions, courses, equipments and resulting works. One who takes a general survey of these indications of intense devotion to what is known in physiological psychology may be skeptical as to the net advantage of it all, and may even suspect that more skepticism and materialism are likely to result. It may fairly be questioned whether the minds of the young men and women of our generation are sufficiently strengthened by sound philosophy and supernatural faith to withstand the natural, even though not essential, effects of a psychology that either ignores or denies the existence of a spiritual soul. But be this as it may, rather if this suspicion be really a judgment confirmed by experience, for this very reason it is imperative on Catholic philosophers to be masters of the "new psychology," that they may be able both to point out its errors and excesses and to assimilate its facts and legitimate inferences to their own system. Dr. Mercier is one of those philosophers who is alive to this duty and is performing it in a way that deserves praise. His present work, by setting forth the good and the bad in contemporary psychology, and by showing how the former lends itself readily to Catholic philosophy, whilst the latter finds therein its antidote, commends itself as a strong auxiliary to the cause he advocates.

---

PRACTECTIONES DOGMATICÆ QUAS IN COLLEGIO DITTON-HALL HABEBAT CHRISTIANUS PESCH, S. J. Tom. VIII. Tractatus I de Virtutibus in genere. II de Virtutibus Theologicis. Friburgi, Herder (St. Louis, Mo.), 1898, pp. x.-314. Price, $1.85.

With the present volume Father Pesch's course of Dogmatics comes within one step of completion. Another volume, promised for next year, treating of Sin and the Consummation of the Universe, is still

needed to conclude the series. The present volume unfolds the dogmatic science of the supernatural virtues in general, and of Faith, Hope and Charity in particular. By way of illustration of the author's method of treating these abstruse subjects, we select almost at random his analysis of the Act of Faith (p. 126).

An analysis of the Act of Faith is the logical resolution of that act into its component principles or causes, just as chemical analysis is the chemical resolution of a compound into its simple elements. Philosophy distinguishes four classes of causes—material, formal, efficient, final. The final cause of the act of faith, like that of any supernatural virtue, is, of course, the beatific vision. The material cause is the human intellect. The formal cause (internal) is the free, firm assent to a revealed truth, motived by authority of God, the revealer. The efficient cause is the intellect as eliciting the act, the will as commanding the act; Divine grace is the stimulating and assisting principle. This seems simple enough, but the analysis does not touch sufficiently the influence, which is partly efficient and partly externally formal, of the object of faith. The object here is understood to be the formal, not the material object. The formal object or motive of faith is, of course, the divine authority. But here is the difficulty. The divine authority and the fact of revelation are not immediate truths, but rest on rational proofs; and this would seem to relegate the act of faith ultimately to human reasoning, and thus to destroy its character as divine and supernatural faith and reduce it to an act of science. The answer is that the preambles to faith—the knowledge of the veracity and infallibility of God, and the fact of His revelation—are not the formal motive of faith, but conditions previous to faith, and hence the analysis of faith does not touch them as constituent elements. But still the question arises, How can the certitude of the act of faith be greater than the certitude of assent to the preambles of faith? The answer is, Because the certitude of the act of faith is not produced by the preambles, but by other causes. There is a twofold certitude in faith—that, namely, of infallibility, and that of adhesion to the truth revealed. The absolute infallibility of faith is produced by supernatural grace, which essentially excludes all error from the act of faith. The certitude of adhesion, which excludes all voluntary doubt, is produced by the command of the will, aided by grace. Hence the certitude of faith comes partly from the aid of grace, partly from the determination of the will; whilst the motives of credibility affect this certitude only by applying the formal motive, without whose presence in thought the will could not command the firm assent of the intellect. Father Pesch, after drawing out various aspects of this objection and its solutions, thus summarizes the analysis of the act of faith, using the first person: "I believe, for instance, the Trinity, because God has revealed it. I believe God's revelation, because He is the *prima veritas*, and the revelation made by the prima veritas I believe, *quia prima veritas est*. Here

the matter ends as regards the objective side of faith. As to its subjective aspect, the cause of faith is the will elevated by grace. I believe because I wish to believe, and I wish to believe because I have realized that it is reasonable and right to believe. Inquiry as to the *motive* can go back no further. Yet it might be asked, How do I know that God is the *prima veritas*, and that he has revealed the truth proposed, so that I have made up my mind that it is reasonable and right to accept that truth? The answer is, I know all this through the motives of credibility, which are various—external and internal, objective and subjective. These motives, however, do not enter into the specification of the act of faith, but precede it and only prove its reasonableness." Hence they do not reduce faith to the category of science.

The analysis of the act of faith thus extracted from the author's text suffers, of course, by our condensation and rendition into English, which is a medium less pliable to abstruse subjects than scholastic Latin. The philosophical mind, moreover, would push the analysis further and deeper. To do so, however, would carry the matter from the province of theology into that of critics, psychology and ontology, just as physical analysis of a material compound carries the process from the domain of chemistry to that of pure physics. The author analyzes within the theologian's sphere, and therein thoroughly and satisfactorily. Indeed, when one takes up any of the splendid volumes of Father Pesch's course one feels like congratulating students of theology in this generation on the possession of such a broad, solid, scholarly help in the pursuit of their studies. The number of works of this class is considerable, but the present is certainly amongst the very best; and besides, what should not be overlooked in this connection is, in view of its excellent typography, paper and binding, it is procurable at a reasonable price.

F. P. S.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES, from the close of the Middle Ages, drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources. From the German of Dr. Ludwig Pastor, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Edited by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus, of the Oratory. Volume V. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co., Ltd.; received from Benziger Brothers, New York. Price, $3.00 net.

In accordance with his praiseworthy custom of dividing the bulky volumes of the German edition into two of his own, Father Antrobus has given us, in this fifth volume, the first half of Pastor's third volume. The disadvantage of leaving the Borgian Pope in the middle of his wretched career is compensated for by the convenience of handling the book. Probably it was just as well to give us the unsavory record on the plan of instalments. This volume, taken in conjunction with the four preceding, teaches us by what steps it became possible for the sacred office of the Papacy to fall a prey to the base greed of a Borgia. How that unprincipled man abused his powers and how the Church of God succeeded in ridding herself of his baneful dynasty can be related in the volumes still to appear.

The Pontificate of Alexander VI. may well be termed the nadir of the Papacy. The few unworthy Pontiffs who had occupied the Throne of the Fisherman before the time of Alexander had risen to power by means external to the Church ; for the most part, had been thrust into the sublime office by the secular arm. Alexander, on the contrary, was the free choice of a venal College of Cardinals, who openly sold their votes for place and money. It was the will of God that His Church, which had survived every other trial in the course of ages, should now prove her ability to survive the sorest of all, the domination of the Borgias during thirteen wretched years. Having come forth from this trial unscathed, it is difficult to foresee what new instrument of torture the infernal powers can bring to bear upon her.

Those who gloat over the crimes and misfortunes of the human race, those who seek to palliate their own sins, or their apostasy, by dwelling upon the delinquencies of Christ's ministers, will find ample material for the satisfaction of their perverse instincts in the too well founded admission of "Rome's Official Historian" that "the rehabilitation of Alexander VI. is a hopeless task." No doubt the changes will be rung upon this theme during the next few years by all the enemies of the Catholic Church. This skeleton in the Papal closet will be repeatedly brought forth to frighten poor unsophisticated souls in search of truth. People who never heard of the immortal Alexander III., or of the other illustrious Pontiffs who have deserved well of the Christian religion and of humanity, will be made thoroughly familiar with the painful fact that once upon a time there was a Pope whom even good Catholic writers admit to have lived and died a carnal sinner.

But every lover of the truth must give even the Borgia his due. When we have deplored the elevation of a man of loose morals to the saintliest office in the world, when we have acknowledged that Alexander was far more solicitous for his temporal dominion and for the advancement of his children than for the vastly more important spiritual interests of the Church, we have made admissions to the full extent of our historical warrant. The darker charges against him (the true charges are serious enough) are being relegated to the limbo of exploded myths.

We have only to repeat the remark we made upon the appearance of the German edition: Dr. Pastor is chiefly concerned with the personal history of the Popes. In his pages we can catch but faint and dubious glimpses of the real work of the Church, which possesses as many centres of activity as there are souls to be sanctified by her teachings and sacraments. An unworthy Pope can no more retard the progress of the Catholic Church than a President elected by fraud and governed by self-seeking politicians can stop the wheels of industry of our great Republic. As well the Church as the solidly founded commonwealth possesses abundant resources for self-regeneration, without having recourse to unlawful revolutions. An unworthy ruler now and then is of invalu-

able benefit to a community by emphasizing the necessity of perpetual vigilance.

Father Antrobus, as might have been expected, has performed his work of translating and editing with consummate skill and fidelity. The translation has all the ease and grace of an original composition. The typographical setting is attractive and free from mistakes. We are proud to possess so valuable a work in our language.

---

A Manual of Catholic Theology. Based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik." By *Joseph Wilhelm, D.D., Ph.D.*, and *Thomas B. Scannell, B.D.* Vol. ii. Large 8vo, pp. 566. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Until quite recently we had few or no works of Catholic Theology in English. We do not know the reason. No doubt several reasons could be brought forward, but we doubt very much if any of them, or all of them together, would be sufficient. With the exception of Moral Theology, which, for prudent reasons, it might not be well to print in the vernacular, lest the weak and ignorant should be scandalized or misled, well-read churchmen contend that the books of the Church should be published in the language of the people. This would apply to Church History, Canon Law, Introductions to the Sacred Scriptures and Commentaries on them, Liturgy, Philosophy and Dogmatic Theology. Those who make this assertion point to the practice of other countries, and particularly Italy, France and Germany. They call attention also to the help which theological students and priests would derive from such publications, while they assert that the educated members of the laity would use them for their own great benefit and the advancement of holy religion. We shall not enter into the controversy concerning the relative merits of Latin and English text-books for theological students, but the practice of other countries and the publication of the present work and others of a like character should be considered in deciding that controversy. We believe that theological students and priests will welcome their old friends in a new dress, and we know that the laity are pleased beyond measure at the wealth of knowledge that is now being laid at their feet. And how abundantly this wealth has been poured out in recent years by author and publisher is evident to any one who reads the announcements of new publications. The Stonyhurst Series of Manuals of Philosophy, Father Hunter's "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology," a'Lapide and Piconio on the Gospels and Epistles, Schanz's "Christian Apology," Hettinger's "Revealed Religion," and many other similar works give some faint idea of what has been done in this direction.

But let us turn our attention to the latest addition to this noteworthy group.

In 1890 the first volume of "Scheeben's Dogmatik" in English came from the press. The work was already famous in the original German,

and Cardinal Manning introduced it to English readers with words of the highest praise. He said: "Dr. Wilhelm and Father Scannell have conferred upon the faithful in England a signal boon in publishing Scheeben's scientific *Dogmatik* in English, and condensing it for careful and conscientious study. . . . The great value of Scheeben's work is in its scientific method, its terminology, definitions, procedure and writing. It requires not only reading, but study, and study with patient care and conscientious desire to understand. Readers overrun truths which they have not mastered; students leave nothing behind them until it is understood. This work needs much conscientious treatment from those who take it in hand."

We feel sure that if the Cardinal were living to-day, he would speak as highly of the second volume as he did of the first, and he would add the same words of warning in regard to its use. The work is now complete. It is not a mere outline, but a complete technical course of Dogmatic Theology such as students for the priesthood generally follow. For that reason it will hardly appeal to lay persons. For such Father Hunter's "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology" would be more suitable. But for those who have taken a course of Philosophy and Theology, or who are engaged in those studies, and who wish to read or study Dogmatic Theology in English, we can safely say there is nothing better than this book.

It is excellent even from a mechanical point of view. The paper, the type, the arrangement of headings and subheadings, the marginal guides to the text—all are admirable, and add not a little to the attractiveness and usefulness of the work.

We understand that eight years were allowed to elapse between the publication of the first volume and the second, because the demand for the first did not warrant the bringing out of its companion. It must have been because the work was not sufficiently well known. It is to be hoped that the complete work will receive the patronage which it deserves, and which will encourage author and publisher to continue to labor on the same lines.

---

PASSION FLOWERS; poems by Father Edmund, of the Heart of Mary, C.P. (Benjamin D. Hill), author of "A Short Cut to the True Church; or, The Fact and the Word." 12 mo., pp. 210. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This volume contains poems published by Father Edmund twenty years ago under the title "Poems, Devotional and Otherwise." The author republishes some of them now in the present volume at the request of friends, readers of the *Ave Maria*, and *litterateurs* of well-merited reputation. He has revised and improved them, and added to them a narrative poem in two parts, entitled "Hermenegild; a Passion Flower of Spain." This collection is called "Passion Flowers" because it contains lyrics and sonnets either in honor of the Passion of Christ or in some way connected with it. Two other volumes are to follow, called

"A Wreath for Mary," containing pieces in her honor, and "Poems of Affection and Friendship." It is clear, then, that Father Edmund is not a new nor an untried poet. For thirty years he has been studying and writing poetry with the firm belief that he can teach men in verse. His great model is Horace, the faultless master of poetic form. He has chosen him because there is neither affectation nor obscenity in him. These are cultivated by modern profane poets without exception, and even by some sacred ones; but they were not fashionable in the classic age, when accuracy and strength marked the productions of the Greeks and Latins.

We ought to be profoundly grateful to Father Edmund for having the courage to say to youthful versifiers, "Poetic form was not invented in order to conceal thought, but to express it." What would be thought of a man who expressed himself so obscurely in prose that his fellows would have to form themselves into organizations to search for his meaning? And yet that is exactly what many of our modern poets have done, and are doing, and no doubt will go on doing as long as they can find persons silly enough to try to understand them. Such poems remind one of the advertisements of worthless articles which are printed upside-down in the papers in order to draw attention to them.

Father Edmund does not belong to that class. He wishes to teach in his poems the same truths he preaches from the pulpit. He makes poetry the handmaid of religion, as all the fine arts should be. He does this, not by sacrificing anything of art, because he follows the examples of the best ancient and modern poets as far as they are worthy of imitation, but he Christianizes them. They sing of human passions, he sings of the Divine Passion; they adore Jupiter, he worships Jehovah; they sound the promises of Venus, he honors Mary.

We owe much, very much, to our modern Christian poets, and especially to our poet priests, for bringing back this handmaid of religion to her true mistress. She never went away willingly—she was stolen. She was never happy in the service of Paganism. She sang perforce, but there was always a false ring to her song. Now, however, in the home of the mistress of her heart, she sings divinely.

Father Edmund's poems are all good, but we quite agree with him that the gem of the collection is the "Sonnets On the Way of the Cross." They are truly poetic and devotional.

The book is handsomely made in every respect, and both in material and form is worthy of unlimited patronage.

---

History of the Roman Breviary. By *Pierre Batiffol, Litt.D.* Translated by Atwell M. Y. Baylay, M.A. 12mo, pp. 392. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Received from Benziger Brothers.

This is one of the most interesting books of the year for clerics and all who are interested in Church history. We learn the history of the Church not only from the lives of her Divine Founder, his apostles and

their successors, but also from her liturgy in regard to the Mass, the Sacraments and the Divine Office. Nor is the account of the institution, gradual development, modification and final perfection of this great public prayer the least important chapter in that grand history. This truth has been realized long before the present day, and the subject has been well treated by able men on many occasions. Hence we have the works of Cardinal Bona, Cardinal Tommasi, Thomassin, Dom Guéranger, and Monsignor de Roskovany. More recently the "Manual" of M. Batiffol has been placed before the French reader, and the English translation of this book is now before us.

The author says that although he calls his manual a "History of the Roman Breviary," he does not pretend to treat so great a subject exhaustively in so few pages. His object has been rather to summarize, and on some points to state more precisely, and as clearly as possible, the results of the labors of the learned writers who have preceded him. In summarizing these results, however, he has in every case verified them by reference to original sources, and corrected them wherever he found them at fault. A full history of the Breviary is not possible, because the necessary books and documents have not been preserved. But an exhaustive use of the material which we have would produce a work far exceeding the bounds of many such manuals as this one.

In this instance the author has attempted to popularize the subject without detracting from it. His aim has been to meet it principally from the standpoint of the Christian archæologist and the history of Christian literature. Hence he has avoided those practical questions of ritual which depend either on moral theology or on the decisions of the Congregation of Rites. He has endeavored, while tracing back the history of the Breviary to its beginning, to express the beauty and excellence of the Roman office, and those who are best fitted to judge concede that he has succeeded.

The translator has worked in conjunction with the author, and has produced not a mere translation of the original, but a new, revised and enlarged edition of the former work. He seems to have done his part of the work well, although we have not the French book for comparison. In its English dress the work is very attractively gotten up, and it should have the effect of making the Breviary better known to persons not already familiar with it, and of increasing the love of those who already know it.

---

THE CHURCH AND THE LAW, with special reference to Ecclesiastical Law in the United States. By Humphrey J. Desmond, of the Michigan Bar. Chicago; Callaghan Co., 1898, pp. 132.

Mr. Desmond, as an author, has an eye for the practical. His "Mooted Questions of History" supplied just what a large number of inquirers, especially among Catholics, were looking for: that is, clear and succinct answers to historical objections that have unfortunately be-

come part of the heritage of non-Catholic minds, and seem to cling to their lodgment with all the pertinacity that associates itself with religious prejudice. To that eminently useful little book he now adds another, no less—in some ways even more—serviceable. In the development of the two orders—religious and civil—the inter-relations, of one to the other, and of individuals, organizations and institutions in one to the correspondents in the other, have given rise to various laws and legal decisions regulating such relations. Mr. Desmond has gathered together these regulations so far as they bear upon the status of things in our country. A brief statement of the subjects thus concerned will suffice to indicate the value of a summary of this kind. There is, for instance, the attitude of the Federal Constitution and the individual State Constitutions in regard to the origin of Civil Authority, Religious Liberty, Sectarian Instruction. These subjects are surely of universal interest. Still more practically important, however, is a knowledge of the decisions of the courts in the various States in respect to the Seal of the Confessional, Bequests to Charity, Parental Rights as regards Schools, Custody of Children, etc.; the laws and enactments concerning Marriage and Divorce, Church Property, its Tenure and Taxation, the Church Pew, the Pulpit, the Cemetery, etc. On these and other kindred questions of a like complex character the author furnishes the reader with compact and exact information. The value of such a manual for the clergy is self-evident. For the lawyers its importance is equally manifest. To the general reader, especially the Catholic, for whom the book is principally intended, it offers a convenient digest of just such knowledge as he frequently looks for yet has hitherto been unable to find except by consulting a thoroughly informed lawyer or by hunting through many out-of-the-way volumes.

---

BUDDHA'S TOOTH, worshipped by the Buddhists of Ceylon in the Pagoda called Dalada-Maligawa at Kandy. Printed by L. Doneda, Codialbail Press, Mangalore, 1898, pp. 82.

The thoroughly experienced naturalist can reconstruct, with the suggestion given him by a small fossil fragment, the entire framework of the original, even though now extinct, organism. It were interesting to know what a Cuvier would build up on "Buddha's Tooth." The "Tooth" is now a bit of yellow ivory, about two inches long by half an inch in diameter. Fancy Buddha's oral cavity if it accommodated such a tooth! And what must the Buddha himself have been if built in proportion! The origin of the cultus paid at Kandy in Ceylon to this famous relic of Gautama is lost in the twilight of fable. The story, however, of its political and financial fate and import is a matter of history which is clearly narrated in the present booklet. Whether the Buddha ever possessed such a mammoth-like dental instrument or not history does not record, but what it does say is that the present bit of ivory is utterly spurious. The original "tooth" described by

Marco Polo in 1284 as *great and thick*, and which the Mahomedans associated with Adam, was doubtless itself a fraud; it certainly was ground in a mortar, burnt, and the ashes strewn in the running waters by the Portugese Archbishop, Dom. Gaspar, in 1560. A fraudulent substitute was, however, imposed on the superstitious natives by the cupidity of the prince, Don Francis, and the native king, Wickrama-Bahu. The fortunes of this spurious relic have been of political and commercial significance, but it is sad to think of it as an object of the religious pomp and reverence bestowed on it in the Kandyan pagoda.

---

De Prohibitione et Censura Librorum Constit. "Officiorum et Munerum" Leonis, PP. XIII. et Dissertatio Canonico-Moralis. Arthuri Vermeersch, S. J. Altera editio, aucta et recognita. Desclee, Lefebvre et Soc., Tornace et Romæ, 1898, pp. 125. Pr. 1½ francs.

So comprehensive and succinct a document as the recent Constitution of Leo XIII. on the *Index*, that is, on the prohibition and censuring of books contrary to faith and morals, must of necessity give rise to many canonical and moral questions demanding interpretation in accordance with the teaching of Ecclesiastical jurisprudence and the principles of Ethical science. The author of the present little work, a member of the Society of Jesus and professor of Moral Theology and Canon Law at Louvain, has supplied such an interpretation. He gives first the Constitution in full, then some general notions as to its scope, obligatory power, etc. The three succeeding chapters deal (1) with the books and other works proscribed—those that are absolutely, those that are conditionally forbidden, those that are *de se suspecti*, yet legally allowed, etc.; (2) with the laws of censure of works proscribed; (3) with the sanction of the prohibitory measures and with the faculties accorded to individuals of reading and retaining forbidden works. On each of these subjects a large number of details demand elucidation and development. These the author supplies, relying, of course, not simply on his own judgment, but using judiciously the arguments and opinions of reliable authorities. The work appeals mainly to the clergy, who, in their capacity as guides of souls and as interpreters and defenders of ecclesiastical discipline, must have exact information on the matter, scope and obligation, interior and exterior, of the Church's laws. Such information, pithily expressed, conveniently disposed and excellently printed, they will find in this pamphlet.

---

Girlhood's Handbook of Woman. A Compendium of the Views of Eliza Allen Starr, Madeleine V. Dahlgren, Eleanor C. Donnelly, F. M. Edselas, Elizabeth Budd Smith, Mary Josephine Onahan, Anna T. Sadlier, Katherine E. Conway, Rose Hawthorne Lathrop, Helen Grace Smith, Mary Elizabeth Cronyn, Jane Campbell, on Woman's Work—Woman's Sphere—Woman's Influence and Responsibilities. Revised and edited by Eleanor C. Donnelly. St. Louis, Mo.: 1898. Published by B. Herder, 17 South Broadway. 203 pp. Price (retail), 80 cents.

The complete list of eminent authors included in the title will assure

the reader of the excellence of this little volume. This is "Woman's Age"; and Catholic girls can scarce afford to be careless watchers of an aggressive movement in which they themselves should mingle, in order both to shape its plans and to profit by its progress. Their modesty, purity, piety, culture, are all needed as sweet influences that may at once restrain and stimulate—for the movement is begetting vagaries as well as virtues. The little book contains essays on the influence and place of Women in Literature, Art, Philanthropy, Society, Finance, Politics, the Middle Ages, the Religious Orders; on Wifehood and Motherhood; on "The Liberties of our Daughters"; on "The Normal Christian Woman"; on "The Apostolate of the Convent Alumna"; and a sonnet on "Motherhood's Responsibilities." What better equipped or more sympathetic writers on such topics could be found?

---

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY. By *Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.* Vol. IV. Centuries XVII.—XVIII. Royal 8vo. Pp. 623. New York: J. Pusted & Co. 1897.

The third volume of Dr. Parsons' "Studies in Church History" was reviewed at length in the QUARTERLY for July, 1896. The writer on that occasion spoke of the author, his qualifications, methods and work in the highest terms. The latest volume of his history justifies all that was then said. It is the only book in the English language treating exhaustively of controverted points of Catholic Church history. It has no rival, and probably it never will have one. It is a good work well done, and it should be appreciated.

The present volume brings the work down to the close of the eighteenth century, and the next volume will complete it.

The student will find here many interesting subjects. Among them are Galileo, Jansenism, Gallicanism, Freemasonry, Voltaire, and the "Constitutional Clergy" of France.

---

COMMENTARIUM IN FACULTATES APOSTOLICAS EPISCOPIS necnon Vicariis et Præfecti-Apostolicis per modum Formularum concedi solitas ad usum venerabilis cleri, imprimis Americani concinnatum ab *Antonio Konings, C. SS. R.* Editio Quarta, recognita, in pluribus emendata et aucta, curante *Joseph Putzer, C. SS. R.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1897. Price, $2.25 net.

This latest and possibly most valuable work of the lamented Father Konings, the ripe fruit of his long years of study and experience, comes to us in a fourth edition, so thoroughly revised and rewritten by Father Putzer as almost to make us doubt whom we should designate as the chief author. The subjects discussed are the most difficult and important that confront our clergy in the course of their spiritual ministrations, and regarding which it is perilous and disgraceful to be misinformed. We consider it the duty of every priest in charge of

souls to possess himself of Father Putzer's admirable Commentary, and to become intimately acquainted with its contents. An occasional hour spent in perusing it may prevent many a serious mistake.

---

KATHOLISCHES EHERECH. Berücksichtigung derim Deutschen Reich, in Oesterreich, der Schweiz und im Gebiete des Code Civil geltenden staatlichen Bestimmungen. Von *Dr. Joseph* [illegible]*itzer*. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $2.75 net.

This is a complete rewo[illegible]king of Weber's treatise on Matrimonial Impediments, which is indeed so revolutionized as to form an entirely new work. It would be difficult to conceive anything more perfect of its kind, being at the same time eminently practical, and, through the running commentary of its foot-notes, backing up every statement in the text by setting forth the authorities upon which they are based. A similar book, with special reference to our local legislation, is a crying need; for there is no subject on which modern statecraft has more widely departed from the injunctions of the Gospel than that of the Sacrament of Matrimony. All the more need of inculcating those Catholic principles which form the very pillars of society.

---

L'INDEX. COMMENTAIRE DE LA CONSTITUTION APOSTOLIQUE "OFFICIORUM." Par *M. L'Abbe G. Peries*. Paris. 1898.

This is a succinct exposition, by the late Professor of Canon Law in the Catholic University at Washington, of the legislation of the Church on the important subject of the supervision of printing. The learned author throws his treatise into the shape of a running commentary on the recent pontifical constitution in which the ancient laws of the Index have been revised to suit the circumstances of modern life. The author's aim is eminently a practical one, and a copy of the valuable little book ought to be found in every episcopal curia.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

HYPNOTISM EXPLAINED. By *Rev. Louis F. Schlathoelter*, pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church, Moberly, Mo. For sale by the author, Rev. L. F. Schlathoelter, Moberly, Mo. Price, in fancy cloth, $1.00, postpaid.

LIFE OF THE VERY REVEREND FATHER DOMINIC, of the Mother of God (Barberi), Passionist, Founder of the Congregation of the Passion in England and Belgium. By *Rev. Piers Devine*, Passionist. 12 mo, pp. 297. London: R. Washburne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRI … *T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R.* 12mo, pp. … York: Benziger Brothers.

SISTER ANNE KATHARINE EMMERI … nslated from the French by Rev. Fran … tten in German by *Rev. Thomas Wege*… 317. Price, $1.50.

THE MISTAKES OF INGERSOLL. By … hurch, Bellevue, Ky. 12mo, pp. 344. … ngs.

BEYOND THE GRAVE. From the Fre… *Sadlier.* 12mo, pp. 300. Price, $1.

EPOCHS OF LITERATURE. By *Cond*… 200. Price, 75 cents. St. Louis: B. H…

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIRST COMMUNICA… hmitt. 12mo, pp. 288. Price, 50 cents.

SHORT LIVES OF FRANCISCAN SAINT… urne. Received from Benziger Brothers.

SONGS AND SONNETS, and Other Poem… arged edition. 12mo, pp. 220. Price, $…

BEFORE THE DAWN. A Book of P… *iser.* 12mo, pp. 145. Buffalo: Peter P…

SONGS OF TWO PEOPLES. By *Jame*… s & Lauriat.

FACTS ABOUT BOOKWORMS, Their His… By *Rev. J. F. X. O'Conor, S.J.* Illust… ncis P. Harper.

MARIOLATRY; New Phases of an Old F… isle, Pa. 12mo, pp. 308. Paper, 25 cen…

CANON SCHMID'S TALES. 3 vols., 16m… ger Brothers.

70755

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM